

cies of the Department of Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 902). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted November 18, 1963]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 8527. A bill to provide for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Kootenai Tribe or Band of Indians, Idaho; with amendment (Rept. No. 903). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 988. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire the Graff House site for inclusion in Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 904). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 5345. A bill to change the name of the Andrew Johnson National Monument, to add certain historic property thereto, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 905). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7458. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 906). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of November 14, 1963, the following bill was introduced on November 15, 1963:

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 9140. A bill making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred Nov. 18, 1963]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 9141. A bill to establish a Farm Corps to assist the peoples of friendly foreign nations in the alleviation of agricultural difficulties; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 9142. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 9143. A bill to amend chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, to revise the pension program for World War I, World War II, and Korean conflict veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9144. A bill to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other

agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOLE:

H.R. 9145. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose additional duties on cattle, beef, and veal imported each year in excess of annual quotas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9146. A bill to amend the provisions of section 15 of the Shipping Act, 1916, to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.J. Res. 804. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Foreign Information and Intelligence; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Res. 568. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred pursuant to House Resolution 103; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9147. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Payne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9148. A bill for the relief of Joseph Aizig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 9149. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Cleve Crusinberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H.R. 9150. A bill for the relief of Miss Leonor do Rozario de Medeiros (Leonor Medeiros); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUTEN:

H.R. 9151. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Esther Benant, nee Rosenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9152. A bill for the relief of William F. Kuhlman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

453. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Maurice R. Franks, Searcy, Ark., requesting congressional investigation of alleged illegal use by the so-called U.S. Committee for the United Nations of false, misleading, and controversial political propaganda on U.S. postage meter stamps, in violation of postal regulations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

454. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting a resolution calling for the publishing of a book to be entitled "Meet the Congressmen"; to the Committee on House Administration.

455. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting a study and review of the entire status of political parties in America; to the Committee on House Administration.

456. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Worland, Wyo., requesting Congress to require and demand better elevator inspection in all U.S. national park Government contractors' facilities; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

457. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Shoshoni, Wyo., relative to his approving of the junketeering U.S. House restaurant headwaiter's recent trip, and

condoning the action by comparing the "cushy" jobs for Ivy Leaguers in the vast executive branch of the U.S. Government; to the Committee on House Administration.

458. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, General Delivery, Shoshoni, Wyo., requesting Congress to attempt to require all salary schedules to be geared solely to take-home pay, thus recognizing the fact that a person's real personal money is that left after governmental taxes have been deducted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 1963

(Legislative day of Tuesday,
October 22, 1963)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

Rev. Alexander Veinbergs, pastor, the Latvian Evangelical Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

For a small nation on the Baltic Sea, this is the day for thanksgiving and hope—thanksgiving for independence and freedom once possessed, hope for a new dawn of liberty, with the help of Thy almighty hand.

On this, Latvia's Independence Day, we thank Thee for the precious gift of liberty we all enjoy here. We pray Thee, Father, let Thine eternal light shine upon the Senate and let it shine from this place throughout the land and the world. Guide the minds and the hearts of the Senators, that they may find the right way, through all confusion, to stand for what is right and true and just. Renew for all of us, O Lord, the inspiration Abraham Lincoln gave to the world one dark November day 100 years ago, when he stood at the graveside of soldiers and spoke for all generations, all nationalities, all who unjustly suffer, and said: "that these dead shall not have died in vain."

There are brethren suffering and dying today. We ask Thee that these shall not suffer in vain, and like "this Nation under God" which has had "a new birth of freedom," so let the small Latvia and other captive nations have their new birth of freedom.

Only then we would witness the world where, speaking in the words of a prophet, "justice rolls down like waters, and righteousness like ever-flowing streams." Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., November 18, 1963.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, November 15, 1963, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that Hon. CARL ALBERT, a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, had been elected Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 912) approving a compromise and settlement agreement of the Navajo Tribe of Indians and authorizing the tribe to execute and the Secretary of the Interior to approve any oil and gas leases entered into pursuant to the agreement.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar was dispensed with.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, it was ordered that there be a morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee.

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week I was interviewed in my office by Mr. Jerry O'Leary, of the Washington Star; Mr. Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch; Mr. J. F. Ter Horst, of the Detroit News; and Mr. George R. Kentner, of the Newark News. A condensation of this interview, I assume, appeared in their Sunday papers. The condensation, which was necessitated by space limitations in the papers, was made by the interviewers. It is, in my judgment, faithful to the sense and tone of the interview, and it had my approval. But a condensation can never be the full story. And insofar as the Senate is concerned, it ought to have the full story. The reporters who conducted the interview were aware of and approved my intention of placing the full verbatim text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD subsequent to the publication of the condensation.

I shall do so today. I want the record to be clear and complete as to my attitude on the questions which have been

expressed of late on this Senate and its leadership. This interview may not be the last word which I shall have to say on the subject. But because the interview was wholly spontaneous and conducted by highly skilled reporters, it provides an authentic indication of what the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, thinks on subjects which are or ought to be of concern—of very deep concern—to every Member of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the verbatim transcript of the interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW WITH HON. MIKE MANSFIELD, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF MONTANA, 2 P.M., WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1963, ROOM S-208, THE CAPITOL

PROCEEDINGS

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, there has been a lot said on the Senate floor and in the newspapers about the quality of leadership in the Senate. Since leadership is frequently measured by what is or is not accomplished, can you tell us how you view the record of the Senate under your leadership?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, as far as the analysis of the leadership or a leader is concerned, that is up to each individual to decide as to whether it is good, bad, or indifferent. But I think the final test is what the Senate has done.

I would say that the Senate, up to this time, has made a very respectable record, and for this the Senate should get credit. As far as the Congress is concerned, we have completed action on 43 pieces of legislation out of 128, including appropriations, asked for by the President this year.

In addition to that, 24 other measures, which have been recommended by the President, have passed the Senate. One measure has a conference report filed and will be brought up some time after the aid bill is out of the way.

There are four measures in conference between the two Houses. That brings us to a total of 72 items passed either by the Congress as a whole or by the Senate, or in conference. Out of a total of 128 Presidential recommendations this year, and that is the total of the Presidential recommendations, that would give us an average of 58 percent up to this moment.

Question. Senator, could you break those down as to whether they are major pieces or minor pieces, and what are some of the measures that have been passed by the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, there have been a number of important measures passed. For example, the Defense Appropriations Act is one. That amounted to about \$47 to \$48 billion. Equal pay for women, the feed grains bill, housing for the elderly, medical education aid, a mental health bill of tremendous importance; maternal and child health services, military construction, military pay, the nuclear test ban treaty, the public debt ceiling has been attended to twice, the difficult railroad labor dispute has been settled at least on a temporary basis until next March 1.

We have repealed the Silver Purchase Act; passed six treaties in addition to the nuclear test ban treaty. In conference we have the Pacific Northwest power bill, the vocational education bill, which is quite important. Out of conference and ready to come up we have the higher education bill, which is also of major significance.

All those bills, of course, are not major, but I would point out that in all the Presi-

dential recommendations, as I see the picture now, there remain only three bills which could be considered of really major significance. They are, of course, the tax bill, the civil rights bill, and the health care for the aged bill.

Question. Senator, do you think it will be possible in the time that is left before Christmas to get action on either of those two big ones, the tax or civil rights?

Senator MANSFIELD. The best I can say at this time is that I am hopeful that one or the other will be brought up before Christmas.

Question. In the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. In the Senate.

Question. As the priority determines, Senator, the civil rights bill will probably have to be first?

Senator MANSFIELD. Whichever one is ready first we will take up.

Question. Senator DIRKSEN estimated yesterday it would be March 15 before the Finance Committee gets the tax bill out on the floor. Does it look that far away to you?

Senator MANSFIELD. Maybe Senator DIRKSEN is being a little too pessimistic. It is my understanding that the hearings will conclude on the tax bill on December 13.

I would assume they would take several weeks to mark up that bill, which would indicate that it might be available sometime after the first of the year for action on the Senate floor.

So I would hope that if we do not get a civil rights bill in between, that we would be ready to take up the tax bill shortly after New Year's.

Question. Senator, it has been generally said and understood that the Congress will probably adjourn on December 20. Do you anticipate the civil rights bill could come up before then? If so, wouldn't that prolong the session due to lengthy debate?

Senator MANSFIELD. No. If the civil rights bill does come up before then, we will take it up, but we will go out at the conclusion of business on December 20 and we will not come back until the day after New Year's.

I see no reason to keep the Senate in during the Christmas and New Year's holidays. After all, this is only the 1st session of the 88th Congress. We have another session. There is no breakoff. There is no final adjournment. We have the time to do the work which will have to be done.

Question. Senator, do you think from now on Congress, because of the growth of the country and so on, is going to be in session all year, or do you think they might do something that would shorten the sessions in the future?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would hope that they could shorten sessions or prepare themselves to operate on a year-round basis. But if they are going to shorten the sessions, they are going to have to bring about some reforms in the rules of the Senate pertaining to germaneness. They will have to do something about the fact that the Finance Committee in the Senate cannot take up a measure such as the tax bill, for example, until the House Ways and Means Committee is through with it and it has passed that body.

I believe the time taken on that bill in the other House was approximately 9 months this year. That applies to other bills out of the House Ways and Means Committee, too.

Question. The custom applies that to appropriations also, does it not?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. Some people say that the House has a constitutional right. I think that is a debatable question. But I would think that a formula based on what Senator RUSSELL proposed some months ago, to the effect that consideration be given to half the bills originating in each House, is worthy of consideration, or at least that we could start hearings at the same time the other body does.

The same reasoning applies to bills out of the Ways and Means Committee because,

unfortunately, the Senate is blamed all too often for delays when, as a matter of fact, we are unable to act in our committees until the opposite committees in the House have acted on the legislation under consideration.

Question. Except for those difficulties you have mentioned, are you generally satisfied with the pace of business in the Senate this year?

Senator MANSFIELD. Yes; I am satisfied. I think that the Senate as a whole has done a very creditable job. I think you only have to look at the calendar to find out that we are pretty well caught up.

If you will check with the individual committees, except for the Finance and the Appropriations Committees, and for reasons beyond their control, you will find that they have been on the ball pretty much all year. Contrary to popular reports, a good deal of really responsible legislation has been reported out of the committees, has been considered by the Senate, and has been passed.

Question. Senator, in view of that, you would think that most of the Members of the Senate would share your pride in what has been accomplished and wouldn't be indulging in some of the criticisms of other Members of the Senate that we had last week.

To what would you attribute this restlessness or backbiting, or whatever it can be described as?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think the Members are getting a little restless, a little edgy. It has been a long session. It hasn't been a dramatic or glamorous session. There are other responsibilities which impinge upon the activities of the Members of this body. But I would say that by and large, there are very few Members who would be willing to stand up and state that they are dissatisfied with the progress of the Senate.

I have heard a lot about these cloakroom rumors. I am afraid that most of these cloakroom rumors come out of the imaginations and the speculations of members of the press. I have yet to see one of these cloakroom commandos that they talk about, and if there are any I wish they would come to me and make their views known, and, as far as I am concerned, would get up on the Senate floor and do the same thing.

Question. Senator, it is frequently said that you believe in dealing with other Senators as one adult to another and that not all Members of the Senate are prepared for that treatment and really would like to have their arms twisted now and then.

Senator MANSFIELD. I would disagree completely. I think this is a body of mature men and women. They want to be treated as equals. They are. I expect to be treated by them as I treat them, and I am.

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, what are your feelings about the resolution introduced the other day by Senator PROXMIER, of Wisconsin, that the leadership of both Houses should get together and try to expedite the business of the second session of this Congress.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think that psychologically it may have some effect, but practically it would have none. After all, what power do the leaders have to force these committees, to twist their arms, to wheel and deal, and so forth and so on, to get them to rush things up or to speed their procedure?

The leaders in the Senate, at least, have no power delegated to them except on the basis of courtesy, accommodation, and a sense of responsibility. I see nothing to be gained by it. I see nothing to be lost by the introduction of that particular resolution.

Question. Sir, did I understand you to say that it wouldn't help if the committees decided not to go along? You did say there is nothing you can do about the committee pace; is that right?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. We can ask the committees, and I have had four

or five meetings this year with committee chairmen, for reports on their work. I have asked them to speed up their procedures on certain pieces of legislation.

They have been most cooperative. There has been no dilatoriness that I am aware of, and despite reports to the contrary I have seen no evidence of any delaying action on the part of the southerners; nor have I seen any evidence of delay on the part of Senator BYRD, whose committee is considering the tax bill at the moment. As a matter of fact, on at least three or four occasions over the past 5 or 6 months Senator BYRD has come to me and asked me to see if there wasn't some way the House could speed up the tax bill so that his committee could get started on it.

He also stated that he thought that they could finish their consideration of the bill in the vicinity of 6 weeks. That has been extended, but I would be the last one in the world to question HARRY BYRD's good faith as some have.

Question. That 6 or 8 weeks would be measured against 8 or 9 months in the House, wouldn't it?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. A lot of people do not take that comparison into consideration.

Question. Senator, do you think the Magnuson plan would help in the future, of having two sessions a year?

Senator MANSFIELD. I certainly do. I have advocated it for a long time because what Senator MAGNUSON's proposal would do would be to have a legislative session and an appropriation session.

At the present time, what we do is to sandwich the appropriation bills, some of them, way up in the tens of billions of dollars between other legislative proposals. We do not give them the attention they deserve. Consequently, I think we are subject to the charge of hasty and ill-considered legislation, although I must admit in all honesty that we do depend upon committees to a large extent, and we are fairly certain that the committees go into the necessary details and we can take their reports and their recommendations with good heart.

Question. Senator, what would be necessary to bring this about?

Senator MANSFIELD. Just the passage of the Magnuson proposal, which I understand is in the Rules Committee, if it has been introduced this year. I am not certain.

Question. He told me the other day he was going to ask the Rules Committee to look into it in the coming session.

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I would like to see it reported out. I would like to see it passed, because while tradition is a great thing in the Senate and I believe in it, I think that as times change the Senate has to change, too. This is one way that we could change.

I think we also ought to reduce the number necessary to invoke cloture from two-thirds of those present and voting to three-fifths. I think we ought to follow Senator PASTORE's idea of a rule of germaneness for the first 4 or 5 hours each day, and I think we ought to do something about the authority which each individual Senator has to object to unanimous-consent requests.

The times call for a change. Changes must be made without undermining the foundations of the Senate as an institution. But with the questions coming before us in this day and age I think that changes are mandatory, though I would not go as far as some of our Members would recommend.

Question. When you spoke of unanimous consent a while ago, did you mean to a committee meeting or unanimous consent on anything?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, I think we have to be a little selective. To committee meetings, for example. There is no reason why committee meetings cannot meet on many occasions while the Senate is in session. In

that way, committee work could be speeded up and legislation could be brought to the floor that much more quickly and possibly as a result in the overall picture the Congress could adjourn that much sooner. But any Senator has the right to object to any kind of a unanimous consent request, and I think that that gives too much power to any one Senator in a 100-Member body.

Question. Senator, do you think a majority of the Senators feel this way about it, as you do, and that such a thing could be passed?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think at times they feel that way, depending on the circumstances. But I think it would be worth a test on the Senate floor and then we would see what the Senate would feel. No one could tell at the moment.

Question. In connection with the pace of the Senate and the matter of getting work done, in the last session, in the 87th, there was considerable criticism that the White House had been too heavyhanded on the Hill. This session some of us have heard comments from Members indicating that the President and his advisers have not been there when their help was needed.

How do you feel about this question of pressure or lack of it or coordination between the Senate and the White House?

Senator MANSFIELD. I have had nothing but the utmost in cooperation insofar as Senate-White House relations are concerned. They have never been heavyhanded. They have been understanding and they have realized that we have our responsibilities.

As far as I am concerned personally, I have nothing but words of praise for the relationship which exists between the White House and this body.

Question. One complaint we hear sometimes is that the scheduling of votes is so uncertain that Senators can't tell when it is safe to be out of town and miss a rollcall vote.

Do you consider that the responsibility of the leadership, to try to group these votes and make the schedule known in advance?

Senator MANSFIELD. Insofar as possible. I must say I have been at fault many times in that respect. But when you have people, colleagues, come to you two or three times a week and say, "Please don't bring up this bill on that day," "Please don't vote at this hour," "I have an engagement out home and I can't be here," it places the leadership in a very difficult position, because the leadership cannot tell a Member to stay on the floor. He can ask the Members to stay on the floor, but they can thumb their noses at him and they do it quite often.

As I said before, the leadership has no real power, none at all. He has to operate on the basis of persuasion, accommodation, understanding, but he has to expect something like that in return. But all too often Members have come to me, and on occasion some have even threatened me, that they didn't want votes at a certain time or on a certain day, that they had engagements back home or they wanted to go some place for some reason, and—very rarely—if I did not accommodate them, well, they would see that there was a lot of talk and no action would be taken on the floor and so forth and so on.

So the result is we have to try and get along with our colleagues on the best possible basis and do the best we can to keep the wheels of legislation running. Keep in mind the fact that there is always other legislation to be considered and that you need this vote, that vote and all these votes. It isn't easy. You are subject to criticism.

I have bent perhaps too often to extend favors of this nature to my colleagues. I have been criticized. The criticism is justified. But I do not know how else to operate if the Members themselves do not show a sense of maturity and recognize the fact that their job is here, to represent the people and

their States, and that their engagements are of secondary importance.

Question. Is there too much absenteeism in the Senate?

Senator MANSFIELD. There is.

Question. Sir, it seems inevitable that if and when the civil rights bill comes up in the Senate there is going to be a filibuster of some kind. I think you are aware that in the past there has been some criticism of you on the grounds you haven't held people's feet to the fire, so to speak, and kept them up all night.

Senator MANSFIELD. I don't intend to. This is not a circus or a side show. We are not operating in a pit with spectators coming into the galleries late at night to see Senators of the Republic come out in bedroom slippers, without neckties, with hair uncombed, and pajama tops sticking out of their necks.

I believe there is a certain amount of dignity and decorum attached to this institution and to the position that each of us holds. Regardless of the consequences, as far as I am concerned, that dignity will be upheld and the best interests of this institution will be looked after as long as I happen to be the leader.

Question. You would rather see the rules modernized than go to an endurance contest?

Senator MANSFIELD. Of course. Who wins in an endurance contest? Not the older members, not those who may be under medical treatment. But the minority wins, because they are well disciplined, they know what they are doing. They operate on a 4-hour shift basis. Some of those who are always spouting off and talking about how much they are for civil rights, this, that or the other thing, where are they when you want them? When you want a quorum call? They are not around.

So as far as being a whipcracker or a coordinator for a Roman holiday, count me out.

Question. Senator, it sounds as though you are making a good case for the proposition that being a Senator is a full-time job.

Senator MANSFIELD. It is, and it is getting to be more and more of a full-time job. I wish my colleagues would all realize it. Most of them do, fortunately, but not all of them.

Question. Do you think, sir, that in light of the fact that you think it is a full-time job that the Senate should undertake, or the Congress should undertake, to establish some kind of code of ethics which it expects of the executive branch, so that Members will not have outside financial and business interests which might interfere with their duties here?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is a question which I do not feel that I am qualified to answer for the Senate. But I do feel I am qualified to answer personally. As far as I personally am concerned, yes.

Question. What would be the nature of such a code of ethics?

Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned, speaking personally, not for the Senate, I think it should list outside stockholdings and other business interests, as has been done by Senators CLARK, YOUNG of Ohio, SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and perhaps others.

I recall several years ago when Senator CLARK listed his outside interests. I listed mine. It was very easy. I had none.

Question. How difficult would it be to get Congress as a whole to require disclosure of that sort?

Senator MANSFIELD. That is something that the Congress, itself, should consider and I personally would not want to talk on it except as it affects me personally.

Question. Sir, do you think personally that this would increase the confidence of

the voters of this country in their elected representatives?

Senator MANSFIELD. Not necessarily, because I think that there are those who, if their holdings were common knowledge, would be looked upon with suspicion every time they voted on a certain kind of measure.

As far as I am concerned, I think that the Senate is a very honest body. I think the individual Members of the Senate are honest representatives of the people. I would not want suspicion to be cast upon them, because after having observed them for several decades now I have nothing but the highest admiration for the membership of this body, not only today but as it existed down through the years that I have been here, and that applies to both Republicans and Democrats.

Question. But the Congress seems to point this suspicion toward people who are selected for executive jobs in the administration by its actions.

Senator MANSFIELD. That is correct. I have felt for a long time that the Congress has carried this idea of conflict of interest entirely too far as regards Presidential appointees. A nominee should not be considered dishonest because a particular administration wants him to undertake a particular job.

The result is we cast guilt on these people who appear before our committees in the process of nomination, unwittingly, of course. We make them strip themselves of their stocks which might come in conflict. I think it is very unfair. I think if a man is brought into Government he should be considered honest until proven otherwise. He should be looked into thoroughly before they are appointed, as I am sure they are, and I do not think they should get rid of their stocks nor do I think they should be subjected to the inquisition which many of them have to suffer on the basis of this conflict-of-interest proposal.

Question. At any rate, you would say what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander?

Senator MANSFIELD. As far as I am concerned personally, yes.

Question. Senator, in light of that, do you think that the Senate's decision to investigate the outside activities of its staff employees should be limited to those employees or should the investigation proceed to wherever the evidence leads it?

Senator MANSFIELD. It should be limited to those employees who are employees of the Senate as a whole. As far as the employees in a Senator's office are concerned, that is that particular Senator's direct responsibility.

As far as the Senators themselves are concerned, that is something which they themselves must face up to.

I would point out that there have been bills in the Rules Committee for well over a decade—I think the longest in time is Senator MORSE's and there have been bills introduced by Senators KEATING, JAVITS, CASE, NEUBERGER, and others—seeking to bring about this disclosure on the part of Senators.

These bills are lying fallow in the Rules Committee. I would hope that the Rules Committee in good time would take them up and report them out and bring them to the Senate floor for consideration and debate.

But getting back to your original question, I think the Williams resolution should be adhered to strictly, and that applies only to employees of the Senate. There are bills to take care of the Senators themselves. They should be taken up in due time by the Rules Committee.

Question. Not as a legal matter, but as a psychological matter, something that might affect the country, isn't there some weight to the argument of a Senate employee who might say, "Well, what is wrong if I have outside business interests, because my bosses do?"

Senator MANSFIELD. There is an argument there and a good one. I must say that as far as the outside interests of Senate employees are concerned, the fault primarily lies with the Senate, itself, because we have laid down no rules, regulations, or guidelines. Therefore, the employees of this body are free to do what they want to, within the limits of the law, and it is not up to us to point the finger at them because we haven't said may nor have we laid out guidelines which they should follow.

There again I would say that basically the fault is the Senate's for not meeting its obligations and laying out rules and regulations.

Question. Do you think that the Senate will do that now, that is, issue such guidelines?

Senator MANSFIELD. I think that they will. As far as Senate employees who are directly or indirectly subject to the Democratic conference, that is being done at the present time.

Question. Do you think the disclosures about Robert Baker, the former majority secretary, have hurt the reputation of the Senate in the country?

Senator MANSFIELD. Well, all I can say is this, that as far as Bobby Baker's work in the Senate was concerned, it was excellent and efficient. He did his job well. As for the rest of the question: yes.

Question. Senator MANSFIELD, do you ever find it frustrating to be leader of a group of 66 other men who range from Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio?

Senator MANSFIELD. I find it frustrating, exhilarating, and depressing.

Question. That is a good note to finish on.

Question. Sir, I just have one other question, Senator, if I may ask it.

You come from Montana and the West supposedly is beginning to look like Goldwater territory to a lot of Republicans and perhaps to many Democrats. How do you feel about your own chances for reelection next year and the chances of the Democratic Party doing a better job of picking up Western States they missed in 1960?

Senator MANSFIELD. First, I wouldn't give the Rocky Mountain West to GOLDWATER. I think it is just as much Kennedy country as it is Goldwater territory.

Second, as far as my own future is concerned, it is a little early for me to say anything. Montana is a two-party State. No one is invincible in this profession. No matter who runs for the Senate next year, he is going to have an extremely difficult job. Campaigns in Montana are tough, but I have been a pretty lucky man. I have been back here for 21 years, which is a long time. I have had the breaks, I have had the benefit of the doubt in the minds of lots of my people.

When we go into next year's campaign, I will either win or I will lose, and whichever way it comes out I will have no apologies and no regrets.

Question. You will have no regrets or no inhibitions about campaigning on the Kennedy ticket?

Senator MANSFIELD. None in the least. I am delighted to campaign on the Kennedy ticket and in behalf of President Kennedy and all the way.

The PRESS. Thank you very much, Senator.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dr. Herbert Scoville, Jr., of Connecticut, to be an Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; and

Benson E. L. Timmons III, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Haiti.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

A bill and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2313. A bill to amend section 1552 of title 10 of the United States Code to provide that every applicant for correction of his military record shall be afforded an opportunity for a hearing; to require the appearance of certain members of the Armed Forces before the boards for the correction of such records; and to provide for judicial review of the decisions of such boards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a long-range plan for the development of buildings and grounds within the area comprising the U.S. Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Public Works.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NOS. 321, 322, 323, AND 324)

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments (No. 325), intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 8747, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROHIBITION OF GUARANTEE BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS OF COMMUNIST COUNTRIES—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 326)

Mr. MUNDT submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2310) to prohibit any guarantee by the Export-Import Bank or any other agency of the Government of payment of obligations of Communist countries, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT OF 1958—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 327)

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 298) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, RELATING TO ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOLS IN AREAS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of November 13, 1963, the names of Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MECHEM, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. SIMPSON were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2304) to extend for 3 years Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, providing assistance for schools in areas affected by Federal activities, introduced by Mr. TOWER on November 13, 1963.

TRIBUTE TO A NOBLE PEOPLE—LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY, NOVEMBER 18

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the lot of small nations has never been an enviable one in a world dominated by aggressive and powerful states, and this has been particularly true in the case of the three small national groups who for several thousand years have made the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea their home. The Latvians constitute one of these three groups which, throughout their long history, whether as free and independent peoples, or as unwilling subjects of alien regimes, has managed to retain their distinct identity and their undying love of freedom.

Today, November 18, marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once free Republic of Latvia. We in this country, who declared our own independence, and who have been fortunate enough to maintain our freedom from oppression, should never forget the attempts which others have made to obtain that most precious of all commodities, freedom, which we so often take for granted. We should continually remind ourselves that others in this world had strived to obtain the same precious commodity, but have lost it by force. We who possess freedom have a responsibility to be ever alert for opportunities whereby we can assist other nations in obtaining a similar degree of freedom.

After suffering under Russia's czarist regimes for nearly 200 years, the Latvians regained their freedom at the end of the First World War, proclaimed their national independence, and established their own democratic Republic. This youthful and small state, at first weak and almost helpless, in time grew strong and prosperous, and, in the course of two decades during interwar years, became a real democratic force in the Baltics. Latvians were prepared to make the utmost sacrifice to defend their independence and freedom. But as the Second World War began, they realized that theirs was a hopeless case, and they could not stave off the threatening Soviet aggression. In mid-1940, the country was attacked and overrun by the Red army. Then it was annexed to the So-

viet Union, thus putting an end to independent Latvia.

Since those fateful mid-1940's, Latvians have not known freedom in their homeland; and to this day they have been held down by Communist tyrants directed from the Kremlin. One of the tragedies of it all is that all true and trusted friends of the Latvian people cannot aid them today in their appalling suffering. On the 45th anniversary of their independence day, let us all hope and pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on November 18, 1918, the people of Latvia, after centuries of struggle and domination by foreign powers, proclaimed their country an independent republic. In 1940 Latvia was invaded by the Soviet Union and forced to become the Communist state it remains today.

Although Latvian freedom was tragically short lived, a yearning for a rebirth of independence continues strong in that country and among its many representatives in the United States. This desire for freedom is eloquently voiced by the American Latvian Association.

Latvia, on the edge of the Baltic Sea, is a land of forests and swift-flowing rivers and farmland. We can associate it in basic spirit with the American frontier, even to the construction of some of its houses made of hand-cut rounded logs similar to those used by our own pioneers. We feel a special bond with the people of Latvia in their quest for liberty.

The United States has traditionally championed the cause of oppressed people, and I fully support the important concept that an appropriate observance of the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia take place on November 18, 1963.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute today to a gallant—and much put-upon—people. I refer, of course, to our friends in Latvia, one of the Eastern European captive nations overrun by the Soviets and since dominated under cruel and oppressive conditions.

For seven centuries prior to this date in 1918, Latvia had no political history it could call its own. The Latvians had been a subject people, buffeted by political fortunes not of their own making. Last of the foreign powers ruling the Latvian states was Russia. Dating from 1795 until proclamation of the republic on November 18, 1918, Russian rule prevailed in the 25,000-square-mile area.

Two years later—on February 2, 1920—Soviet Russia renounced "voluntarily and forever" all rights over these people. Yet a scant 20 years afterward the same Soviet Russia, in the face of that 1920 treaty, forcibly occupied Latvia, along with Estonia and Lithuania.

Prior to outbreak of war in 1939, Latvia made every reasonable effort to maintain neutrality. But this was not to be. By the beginning of June 1940, Russia demanded unlimited military occupation of the Baltic States. By mid-June, all of Latvia was in the hands of Soviet troops. Under the stern eye of Soviet

Russian military leaders, Latvia along with the other Baltic States elected a parliament with a Communist majority. From there it was a short step to petitioning for union with the U.S.S.R.

Despite this, a group of resistant patriots has maintained a free world alliance, pointing toward the day their homeland will again be freed from foreign tyranny.

On this 45th anniversary of short-lived Latvian independence, we renew our pledge never to abandon them to unending Soviet oppression. In October of 1961, the Assembly of Captive European Nations sent a message to their peoples to which I subscribe. Their main task, they said, has been to "voice your innermost aspirations" which they described as "the end to foreign domination and a free choice of the political, social and economic system under which you wish to live."

Can any free people, under God, aspire to less? I think not.

GRAIN SHIPMENTS TO HUNGARY ILLEGAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I have written to the Secretary of Commerce to challenge the legality of the recent action of the Maritime Administration in permitting grain shipments to Hungary to be transported entirely by foreign-flag vessels.

This decision is contrary to our national interests, to both law and custom. It hurts our balance-of-payments position. It deprives Americans of jobs they need.

All the legal precedents on this question indicate that at least 50 percent of any foreign shipments of American grain should be carried in American-flag vessels.

The Congress has repeatedly made this policy explicit and the pronouncements from the Maritime Administration have always been consistent with this policy. The present action by the Maritime Administration would seem to be completely in violation of all legal precedents.

Indeed, the Maritime Administration has consistently followed the policy of requiring at least 50 percent of cargo financed by an instrumentality of the Federal Government to be carried in American ships.

This policy has been enforced in shipments to countries that have had the warmest and friendliest relations with the United States. The Maritime Administration has insisted on this policy even when it is clear that the shipment of goods is to an ally who will stand with us against communism.

But now, in shipment to Communist countries—and Hungary has as black and brutal a Communist record of suppression of human liberty as any nation—the Maritime Administration seems to be abrogating the law and violating established custom to provide discriminating, preferred treatment to the Communist government of Hungary.

The Maritime Administration has apparently taken action, quietly and without public notice, to permit foreign vessels to carry all corn being shipped to Hungary under the recent agreement.

Such a policy will undoubtedly constitute a precedent for similar decisions with other grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

I have been consistently opposed to these grain shipments, on the ground that they serve to strengthen the Soviet bloc economically relative to our own economy. I think the decision by the Maritime Administration accentuates and intensifies the relative benefits given to the Soviet bloc by these deals, and correspondingly hurts us in the cold war struggle.

The decision by the Maritime Administration also deprives American shippers of a fair share of this trade with a Communist country. Such trade was originally justified by the Administration on the ground that it would benefit the American economy. Yet foreign-flag vessels will receive all of the benefits from the shipments of products.

Our balance of payments is presently in serious deficit. The shipments of grain to the Soviet Union and its satellites have been justified on the ground that this will aid our balance of payments. Yet one of the principal positive factors in our balance of payments is shipping income. That shipping income is to be denied to Americans under the Maritime Administration actions.

P.R. 17, approved by the 73d Congress on March 26, 1934, states in part:

That it is the sense of Congress that in any loans made by . . . any instrumentality of the Government to foster the exporting of agricultural or other products, provisions shall be made that such products shall be carried exclusively in vessels of the United States.

The Maritime Administration action is a clear violation of this congressional expression of policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my letter to the Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. LUTHER HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that in the recent sale of U.S. corn to Hungary, credit is being extended to Hungary over an 18-month period. I further understand that this credit is being financed by a New York bank and the Export-Import Bank is providing a 100-percent guarantee on the loans. My impression is that such a loan arrangement necessitates at least 50 percent of the corn being shipped to Hungary in American-flag vessels. Yet apparently the Maritime Administration has ruled that none of the grain needs to be carried in American vessels. If true, this decision is contrary to our national interests, to both law and custom. It hurts our balance-of-payments position. It deprives Americans of jobs they need.

All the legal precedents on this question indicate that at least 50 percent of any foreign shipments of American grain should be carried in American-flag vessels.

The Congress has repeatedly made this policy explicit and the pronouncements from the Maritime Administration have always been consistent with this policy. The present action by the Maritime Administration would seem to be completely in violation of all legal precedents.

The Maritime Administration has apparently taken action, quietly and without public notice, to permit foreign vessels to carry all corn being shipped to Hungary under the recent agreement. Such a policy will undoubtedly constitute a precedent for similar decisions with other grain shipments to the Soviet Union.

I have been consistently opposed to these grain shipments on the grounds that they serve to strengthen the Soviet bloc economically relative to our own economy. I think the decision by the Maritime Administration accentuates and intensifies the relative benefits given to the Soviet bloc by these deals and correspondingly hurts us in the cold war struggle.

The decision by the Maritime Administration also deprives American shippers of a fair share of this trade with a Communist country. Such trade was originally justified by the administration on the grounds that it would benefit the American economy. Yet foreign-flag vessels will receive all of the benefits from the shipments of products.

Our balance of payments is presently in serious deficit. The shipments of grain to the Soviet Union and its satellites have been justified on the grounds that this will aid our balance of payments. Yet one of the principal positive factors in our balance of payments is shipping income. That shipping income is to be denied to Americans under the Maritime Administration actions.

P.R. 17 approved by the 73d Congress on March 26, 1934, states in part: "That it is the sense of Congress that in any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government to foster the exporting of agricultural or other products, provision shall be made that such products shall be carried exclusively in vessels of the United States, unless, as to any or all of such products, the Shipping Board Bureau, after investigation, shall certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other instrumentality of the Government that vessels of the United States are not available in sufficient numbers, or in sufficient tonnage capacity, or on necessary sailing schedule, or at reasonable rates."

The Maritime Administration action is a clear violation of this congressional expression of policy.

On June 5, 1934, the Attorney General expressed the opinion that P.R. 17 was not to be regarded as mandatory in all cases. However, it is my understanding that, in fact, very few, if any, cases occurred until after World War II in which P.R. 17 was not followed.

On September 12, 1945, the then president of the Export-Import Bank wrote the Administrator of the Maritime Administration encouraging the Administration to waive the P.R. 17 rule in some cases. The reason for the requested waiver was that we were attempting to promote postwar reconstruction by extending grants and loans to various foreign countries and would be, under P.R. 17, taking away with one hand the dollars which were being made available with the other. This policy consideration, of course, is not germane at the present time, especially in view of our balance-of-payments difficulties.

In replying to the president of the Export-Import Bank, the Maritime Administrator stated in part: "The Merchant Marine Act of 1936 emphasizes the congressional policy that a substantial portion of foreign trade be carried in American bottoms. This has been generally construed to mean that at least 50 percent of our foreign commerce in each trade route should be carried in American bottoms."

"It is our thought that the operations of our respective agencies could be most effectively coordinated in this respect if you would insert in your loan agreements a stand-

ard clause, providing that all shipments be on flags of American vessels, as indicated by P.R. 17, except to the extent that exemptions from the resolution may be permitted by the Maritime Commission.

"The Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration would be prepared to police the above quoted contractual provision and report to you periodically as to the arrangement made in connection therewith. The Commission would insist in all cases upon 100 percent shipments in American bottoms unless the foreign government involved gave satisfactory assurances with respect to reasonable participation by American vessels in the transportation of imports to and exports from that country. As a rough guide in this connection a minimum of 50 percent participation would be used."

On April 21, 1952, the then Maritime Administrator wrote the Secretary of State further on the waiver policy. In that letter it was stated in part: "The Attorney General has held that P.R. 17, while not mandatory, is in itself the expression of the basic policy of the United States and serves as a protection against, and amelioration of, the damaging effects which result when exports purchased from the United States with proceeds of loans made by this Government are removed from the scope of normal commerce and their shipment controlled by the recipient of such loans."

"One consideration to the granting of such general waivers is that the recipient nation accords fair and nondiscriminatory treatment to U.S. registered vessels on a parity with its own vessels in the international trade. This includes attention to such features as charges on vessels, taxes, berthing facilities consular fees paid by shippers, and conversion of freight money, as well as the practice of the foreign nation toward efforts of U.S.-flag lines to compete and participate in cargo movements controlled within that country."

These quotations from earlier correspondence seem to me to establish appropriate guidelines for U.S. policy with respect to loans and foreign freight shipments. My understanding is that the policy of the Maritime Administration has never been to waive more than 50 percent of the U.S.-flag requirement under P.R. 17. Moreover, the waivers of up to 50 percent have only occurred in two types of situations, namely: (1) when the Maritime Administration certifies that U.S.-flag vessels are not available in sufficient numbers, or tonnage capacity, as to sailing schedules or at reasonable rates, or (2) when so-called general participation waivers are authorized permitting the recipient nation vessels to share in the traffic. In fact, a 50 percent U.S.-flag minimum clause was indicated in specific foreign aid acts in 1948, 1949, and other years up to 1954, the so-called Cargo Preference Act.

Indeed the Maritime Administration has consistently followed the policy of requiring at least 50 percent of cargo financed by an instrumentality of the Federal Government to be carried in American ships.

This policy has been enforced in shipments to countries that have had the warmest and friendliest relations with the United States. The Maritime Administration has insisted on this policy even when it is clear that the shipment of goods is to an ally who will stand with us against communism.

But now, in shipment to Communist countries—and Hungary has as black and brutal a Communist record of suppression of human liberty as any nation—the Maritime Administration seems to be abrogating the law and violating established custom to provide discriminating, preferred treatment to the Communist Government of Hungary.

In view of this history, I would like to inquire as to the type of waiver which was pro-

vided in the case of the corn sales to Hungary. I recognize that this decision is made by the Maritime Administration which is under your general direction.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL REGISTER ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion which I made on April 26 to reconsider H.R. 2837, a bill to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

H.R. 2837 will be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICITS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I address myself today to the question of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits and their effect upon our ability to lead the free world in its quest for security and peace.

It is well known that I have spent much time and thought on the question of military security. The burden of my advocacy in this area has been the development of balanced forces to give us flexibility and ample coverage of all eventualities threatening the military security of the United States and the Western World.

While the United States has been meeting the military threat successfully by the development of forces in being and the will to deter potential aggressors, in the economic field we may have allowed ourselves to drift into a situation where we are gradually losing freedom of action in our internal and external economic policies.

In any case we are losing both mobility and flexibility in responding with economic resources to the threat of Communist subversion as distinct from military confrontation; and, if the situation is allowed to continue, we could fall under the influence and policy dictation of other countries.

National power depends upon the combination of military and economic re-

sources available and properly mobilized. What will it profit the United States in the long run to have succeeded in stopping the expansion of communism on the present boundaries of the Sino-Soviet system from Korea to Vietnam, Iran, Turkey, Greece, and central Europe if, in the meantime, we let our freedom of action slip away in the economic field, and are unable to respond adequately to threats of subversion in Africa, South America or the Far East?

This is the danger we run because of the continued balance-of-payments deficits which have built up so high cumulatively, that today, from a creditor nation a few years ago, we are fast becoming a debtor nation; and our creditors, mostly in Western Europe, could be acquiring the influence, if not the power, of dictation over us in the field of economic policy.

This is a complex subject. It will take more than one statement to present the Senate the major issues as I see them.

THE FACTS

Since World War II, the United States has spent, advanced, lent, or given away \$46 billion for lend-lease and UNRRA, \$100 billion for foreign aid and military assistance, and \$36 billion for direct U.S. military expenditures abroad, a total of \$182 billion, which is 60 percent of our national debt.

As late as 18 years after World War II, our expenditures for foreign aid and military presence abroad is still costing us some \$8.5 billion a year, estimated as follows: \$4 billion through mutual security legislation; \$1½ to \$2 billion through Public Law 480, agricultural disposal program; \$3 billion plus on military expenditures.

This does not include contingent liabilities created by various insurance and guaranty programs undertaken by the Export-Import Bank and the AID in the field of exports, private investments and housing. Nor does it include contingent liabilities authorized, or to be authorized, as callable subscription to the capital of international financial institutions, such as the Inter-American Development Bank and the International Development Association, and as we know, additional commitments incident to the latter are being asked of the Congress now.

Nor does this figure of \$8½ billion a year include the annual cost of interest on that portion of the public debt which is due to past foreign assistance and military expenditures. And even if you eliminate lend-lease as a wartime activity and UNRRA as a humanitarian undertaking the expenditures since 1945 of \$136 billion for foreign aid and military purposes constitutes one-third of the national debt and one-third of the annual interest charge; that is, \$3 billion a year.

Viewed in this light, the annual cost of past and present foreign aid and military activities abroad comes to \$11½ billion a year, 2 percent of the gross national product, and not "less than 1 percent," which some would like us to believe in order to induce even greater appropriations for foreign aid.

This amount is, of course, exclusive of the costs of our own defense, and of the Atomic Energy Commission, and space activities appropriations, that total over \$55 billion a year, and which are the bulwark of the free world defenses.

Up to 1950, because the United States was practically the sole supplier of needed materials and equipment in the reconstruction of Western Europe, we were able to meet this demand upon our resources, created by the foreign aid program, through a surplus of exports over imports. Beginning in 1950, however, this surplus was not enough to equalize our expenditures abroad and, therefore, we started running a balance-of-payments deficit.

From 1950 through 1956, the cumulative deficits amounted to \$8.2 billion, or an annual average of between \$1.1 and \$1.2 billion.

In 1957, we had a surplus because of the Suez crisis, which increased the demand for U.S. supplies, fuel, and other necessities for Europe.

Beginning in 1958, however, we started running annual deficits of \$3 to \$4 billion a year; and in the 5 years between 1958 and 1962, the total cumulative deficits amounted to \$17 billion.

Adding the deficits built up during the preceding period just mentioned—1950 to 1956, inclusive—the cumulative deficits from 1950 to 1962 amounted to over \$25 billion. This was financed by the export of gold of \$8 billion and the building up of current liabilities or debts of \$17 billion.

The drain on our gold supply has pulled down our gold reserves from \$24 billion in 1950 to less than \$16 billion today.

A little less than \$12 billion is needed as statutory reserves, leaving only \$4 billion of free gold to pay demand liabilities of \$27 to \$28 billion, including our commitments to international institutions.

Another way of facing these facts is to say that of the \$100 billion we spent on foreign assistance since 1945, and the \$36 billion for military expenses, little better than 18 percent was not covered by current earnings through exports; and that this has been financed mainly by the willingness of other countries to extend the U.S. credit by leaving their reserves in bank deposits or in short-term U.S. Government and other securities.

Actually, therefore, we have been financing our foreign assistance operations and military expenses abroad by currently borrowing money from foreign governments and institutions abroad.

This is the net result over the 18-year period; but today, with deficits running between \$3 and \$4 billion, we might say that all of our foreign aid operations are undertaken on borrowed money; or, if we wish to include military expenses as well, 50 percent of the direct cost of foreign aid and military operations abroad is being financed by borrowed money.

Over \$12 billion of our current liabilities are held by Western European countries, mainly those in the Common Market. Any one of those countries could embarrass us tomorrow by demanding

gold in payment of their current claims upon us.

This is to some extent a Damoclean sword over the U.S. Government. I believe it explains some of the lack of success we have had in such fields as trade negotiations and agricultural policy, as experienced in our dealings with the Common Market. The bargaining power in the economic field has at least partially shifted from the United States in favor of Western Europe.

If such a result had been obtained in the field of U.S. military capability, most everyone in this body would be agitated. But in the economic field, it seems to me we may have allowed our power of independent action to be subjected to external pressures without an accurate analysis and confrontation of the causes so that immediate remedial action may be taken.

If it is true, as some assume, that continuance of the cold war in a period of peaceful coexistence means the erosion of U.S. economic power, and the subjugation of our sovereignty and freedom of action to foreign influences, then we must be careful that our own policies are not responsible for bringing about the attrition of U.S. economic independence.

In the next statement I shall analyze how we got into this position.

FIELD ARTILLERY ANNIVERSARY

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the U.S. Army Artillery celebrates its 188th anniversary this week. All of us have reason to be grateful to the brave men of the Artillery who have served as the primary supporting arm of the Infantry and one of the strongest elements of our national defense since the Continental Congress named Col. Henry Knox chief of artillery for Gen. George Washington on November 17, 1775.

The guns, mortars, and howitzers of colonial days were pulled by oxen or by men. Now, the Field Artillery arsenal includes a wide variety of mobile, flexible, and versatile arms. To the guns which could mass fire on one target in World War I to those which could quickly switch fire from one target to another in World War II, we have added surface-to-surface missiles and rockets. This year has seen the introduction of the new 175 mm. tube-type Artillery piece. The Army's Lance has come off the drawing board in 1963 and is in the engineering mockup stage of development.

The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center at Fort Sill, Okla., with Maj. Gen. L. S. Griffing in command, is the testing ground for new developments and the training school for the Nation's Artillery units. A few weeks ago, the men of Fort Sill's 2d Battalion, 44th Artillery, successfully fired five second-generation Pershing missiles 350 miles from the Black Mesa near Blanding, Utah, to the White Sands Missile Range.

Aviation has joined with ground guns in another system recently tested at Fort Sill called the visual airborne target locator system. Men in an aircraft select a target, then measure the angles to the target through a visual sighting device and then relay the material to a ground

station. Artillerymen there plot the position of the aircraft, and in turn, the target.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article from the Fort Sill Cannoneer of Friday, November 15, and a tribute to artillerymen by General Griffing.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Sill (Okla.) Cannoneer, Nov. 15, 1963]

FORT SILL FILLS MAJOR ROLE IN HISTORY OF ARTILLERY—18TH ANNIVERSARY RECALLS SAGA OF MORTARS, MISSILES

The time was exactly 11:02 a.m. on a beautiful Indian summer day in late September, this year. The place was a windswept tract of land known as Black Mesa, near Blanding, Utah. The event was the first long-range overland firing of an Army missile, the latest milestone in the 188-year saga of the U.S. Army Artillery.

At that moment, the Army's second generation Pershing roared skyward, streaked to the edge of space, and 7 minutes later fell to the earth again some 350 miles away on White Sands Missile Range. It was the first of five successfully fired by the men of Fort Sill's 2d Battalion, 44th Artillery, from Black Mesa in the days that followed, marking the advent of increased firepower to fulfill the Artillery's vital mission as primary supporting arm of the Infantry and Armor.

The highly mobile and devastating punch of today's Artillery arsenal is a far cry from that of November 17, 1775, when the Continental Congress named Col. Henry Knox as Gen. George Washington's chief of artillery.

Colonel Knox's weapons consisted of an accumulation of guns, mortars and howitzers of every sort. The tubes were brass and the carriages wood. They were often pulled by oxen or manhandled into position. Yet Colonel Knox earned such a reputation with his small force that he soon was promoted to major general, and later became the United States first Secretary of War.

BIRTHDAY SUNDAY

Sunday the U.S. Army Artillery will observe its 188th anniversary. Since its colonial birth, the Artillery has advanced steadily. Many times over it has proven itself the devastating force in wartime.

By the beginning of the Civil War, artillery weapons had been improved but many weapons were still smooth-bore with short range. Rifled barrels, longer ranges, and the forerunners of modern firing techniques were introduced in the Civil War, but didn't come into general widespread use until World War I.

Weapons were much heavier by this time, although the United States had not manufactured enough for its rapidly expanding Army. The famous French 75 was the commonly used weapon of the day. Weaponry in general was more lethal. Tactics had changed too, to include the devastating technique of massing fires of many guns on one target. Military experts say the Artillery accounted for over 75 percent of the battlefield casualties in World War I.

It was during the 1930's that the U.S. Army Artillery earned its worldwide reputation with its revolutionary new techniques and tactics. Chief among these was the fire direction center. This permitted the momentary switching of the fire of a hundred or more guns from one target to another. The effectiveness of these innovations was proved in World War II.

HEAVIER WEAPONS

With the advent of World War II, the U.S. Army had begun replacing the French 75 with 105 mm., 155 mm., 240 mm. and 8-inch howitzers and the 155 mm. gun. Shooting

these new and heavier weapons by fire direction techniques, U.S. artillerymen established themselves as the world's best.

At the war's conclusion, Gen. George S. Patton stated: "I do not have to tell you who won the war. You know. The artillery did."

Since World War II, the atomic capability and the Army's amazing array of surface-to-surface missiles and rockets have emerged. The artillery arsenal has been further enhanced by additions and improvements to the traditional tube-type cannon weaponry. Today, more than ever, the field artillery is recognized as one of the Army's most valuable elements, the greatest killer on the battlefield. The field artillery arms are so potent, mobile, flexible, and versatile that there is one to deliver the exact force needed in any present-day combat situation, either a limited or a general war.

The U.S. Army Artillery and Missile Center is the focal point of the artillery arm. It's the birthplace and schoolhouse of the Army's Field Artillery units and the testing ground for the never-ending program of development.

This year saw the introduction of the Army's first new tube-type artillery piece in a decade, the 175 mm. gun and the widespread proliferation of Fort Sill bred units employing the second generation Sergeant and Pershing missile systems. Looming on the horizon is the Army's Lance which came off the drawing board in 1963 and is in the engineering mockup stage of development.

Through all the Nation's wars, the artillery has earned a justified reputation, not only as the most deadly but also as one of the most dependable, respected, and progressive elements of the Army.

As Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer, Supreme Allied Commander of NATO forces, said recently "During the U.S. artillery's continuous existence since 1775 to the present day, its members have earned a reputation for distinguished service to country. Today, they continue to make a vital contribution to the security of our Nation."

[From the Fort Sill (Okla.) Cannoneer, Nov. 15, 1963]

GENERAL GRIFFING HAILS ARTILLERYMEN

Throughout its 188-year history, the U.S. Artillery has been recognized as one of the Army's most valuable elements—the greatest killer on the battlefield.

Since 1775 the mission of the Artillery has been the same—the decisive, timely and accurate fire support of the ground-gaining arms. In pursuit of this mission, artillerymen have constantly strived to increase their preparedness—seeking better weapons and techniques. As a result, the artillery has always been recognized as one of the most progressive branches of the Army.

Although weaponry has evolved from muzzle loaders to supersonic missiles, the key to success has remained the same. The quality soldier always has been, is, and will continue to be the basis of our effectiveness and strength.

As we observe the 188th anniversary of the U.S. Army Artillery, we at the Artillery and Missile Center are proud of our part in the defense of the free world—as home of the Army's greatest destructive force.—Maj. Gen. L. S. GRIFFING.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 1:30 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to make a unanimous-consent request, in which I hope my distinguished colleague, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], will join.

I have endeavored to call up various pieces of proposed legislation available for consideration at the moment, but, for some reason or other, it is not possible to have Senators on the floor to direct consideration of the legislation.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection (at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the Senate took a recess until 1:30 o'clock p.m. the same day.

On the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. NELSON in the chair).

GEN. PAUL HARKINS, SENIOR U.S. MILITARY OFFICER IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am disturbed by reports in the press seemingly inspired which seem to have as their objective the removal of or the undermining of Gen. Paul Harkins in his post as the senior U.S. military officer in South Vietnam.

He is being charged with having sympathized with the regime of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem and it is alleged that some of the Vietnamese generals now in control of the new government feel that he will be out of sympathy with the aims of the new regime.

May I say that I am happy that President Kennedy and the Pentagon have announced their full support of General Harkins and have even extended his mission beyond his scheduled return next February. I approve this stand wholeheartedly.

General Harkins is a soldier in the best tradition of this country and it is his job to work with constituted authority, and he has done so in the past and will do so in the future. He has represented this country with distinction and ability and has proved himself to be a good man under extraordinarily difficult circumstances. I am happy to note that the multiplicity of authority which existed prior to Ambassador Lodge's posting to Saigon has now been done away with and that the Ambassador is fully recognized as the overall head of American activities in Vietnam and that in this capacity he will have unquestioned supervision of American missions there.

In my opinion, Ambassador Lodge and General Harkins make a good team and deserve our confidence and support, and not the carping criticism which seemed to have taken root in the case of General Harkins, but is now, I hope, effectively squelched.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the bells ring when the recess was concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They did not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me briefly?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would hope that the recess which has just been concluded will not be interpreted as dawdling or time wasting. Nor was it for the purpose of a long lunch at the Banker's Club.

The Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in their capacity as leaders, if you wish, were on the floor prepared to do business. But where was the business? Where were the Senators to do it? A quorum bell does not necessarily bring the same response in the Senate as the alarm bell brings in a firehouse.

The choices before the leadership in these circumstances are not inexhaustible. As a practical matter, there are two, and if anyone knows of any other I would be pleased to hear them. The choice is to recess or to invite some Member to deliver a speech on some subject or another, if the spirit so moves him.

The leadership chose to recess the Senate in the hope that the committees might move along with their work without interruption.

But I must say, Mr. President, if appearances were what mattered, the other alternative could have been chosen. I might even have persuaded myself, I suppose, that the echo of my voice in a largely empty Chamber still gives the appearance of a Senate more occupied than a Senate enveloped in the silence of a recess.

May I say that my remarks in no way are intended to reflect on the distinguished Senator from West Virginia who has been ready to start on his bill and who so courteously yielded to me. He is one of the hardest working members of this body, whose attention both to responsibilities in committee and on the floor exceptional in every respect.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed last week, the majority leader made it abundantly clear what the business would be when the Senate resumed this day, Monday. A

variety of measures could have been considered. There was the bracero bill, or rather, concurrence in the House amendment to that bill. There was the legislative appropriation bill conference report. There were a number of bills on the calendar. Then there was the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Also ready was the independent offices appropriation bill.

I think it is a distressing situation, to say the least, that when the majority leader is ready and a token quorum call has been uttered to summon Members of the Senate to the floor, we could not find the Senators in charge of the respective bills that were announced as the order of business. I must concur in the feelings the majority leader has expressed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to exclude from that statement the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who was prepared, and who was on his way, but Senators were absent from the Chamber.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from West Virginia has probably been more diligent in pursuing the affairs of the District of Columbia, to keep them on even keel, than anyone I have known of in my time who has served either as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia or on the legislative committee. I served on the District of Columbia Committee in the House for 16 years, and I served as chairman for 2 years. I was assigned, in my first assignment on the Appropriations Committee, to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

I know what a thankless task it is. I know it does not show up in the form of political profit back home, because people far removed from the District of Columbia are rather indifferent to the affairs of the District. Yet this is the Nation's Capital, and there are many problems to be carefully considered, so that reasonable and good answers to those problems can be found.

I salute the Senator from West Virginia for the valuable service he has rendered in connection with the pending bill. I was delighted that the Appropriations Committee, by a vote of 19 to 7, sustained his position.

The editorial which appeared in the Washington Star was richly deserved. Once more I compliment the Senator on the task he has performed on this appropriation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I concur wholeheartedly in what the Senator from Illinois has said.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I am grateful for the kind remarks that have been made by the distinguished majority leader and the equally distinguished minority leader.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the Dis-

trict of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the committee report which is on the desks of Senators presents a clear picture of the appropriations that are contained in H.R. 7431. Nevertheless, I shall attempt to explain, as briefly as possible the contents of the bill, because Senators who are not present may wish to read the Record. For their benefit, and for the benefit of the general public, I shall attempt to explain the appropriations contained in the bill.

The bill before the Senate contains an appropriation of \$319,582,825. This, of course, takes into consideration the late passage of the bill, and makes pro rata reductions amounting to \$3,393,478.

The appropriation is \$35,296,025 over the House appropriation of \$284,286,800. It is \$23,930,861 over the appropriations of last year, but it is \$9,141,175 under the budget estimate.

The appropriation can be broken down as follows:

For operating expenses, \$263,011,025; for capital outlay items \$51,582,000; for repayment of loans and interest, \$4,989,800.

The total estimated revenues for fiscal 1964 amount to \$337,308,000. This figure, of course, includes Federal payments in the amount of \$47,868,000 to the general fund, water fund, and sanitary sewage works fund, and Treasury loans in the amount of \$20,800,000 to the general fund and to the sanitary sewage works fund.

The estimated required expenditures amount to \$328,747,000, thus leaving an overall surplus in all funds as of June 30, 1964, of \$8,561,000. As to the general fund, the anticipated revenues will amount to \$281,386,000.

This can be broken down as follows:

Federal payment, \$45 million; Treasury loans, \$12,800,000; revenue collection, \$212,325,000; surplus carryover from June 30, 1963, \$11,261,000.

The estimated expenditures from the general fund amount to \$278,800,000.

That leaves an estimated surplus in the general fund as of the end of the present fiscal year of \$2,586,000.

The Federal payment, as I have already indicated, amounts to \$45 million. This is \$15 million over the Federal payment of last year. It is \$15 million over the House appropriation. It is \$5 million under the budget estimate. It is \$5 million under the authorization carried in Public Law 88-104, enacted by Congress on August 27, 1963.

The committee feels that the amount of \$45 million is necessary because of the increased needs of the city. Considering the late passage of the bill, the committee did not feel it wise to appropriate the full authorization of \$50 million. The committee also felt that the figure of \$45 million would come nearer to receiving acceptance by the other body than would the full appropriation of \$50 million at this time.

I point out that Federal grants in aid for the District of Columbia last year amounted to \$54,853,442, which is \$12,124,595 over the previous year.

Mr. President, I believe this briefly explains the picture as it pertains to appropriations, anticipated revenues, estimated surpluses, and fund requirements for the forthcoming fiscal year.

At this time I shall attempt to explain in brief the appropriations for four of the major departments, inasmuch as these are the departments which normally seem to be of the greatest interest to the general public.

I shall first discuss the Police Department. The bill appropriates \$31,032,543, or \$4.1 million over last year, for the Police Department. This amount is the full budget estimate. The committee did not reduce the budget estimate by a single penny. This will allow the appointment of 100 additional privates to the police force, permitting the Department to reach the full authorized level of 3,000 policemen. The bill provides money for 25 additional canine corps teams, thus enabling the department to have a total of 100 canine corps teams.

The bill provides money for walkie-talkie equipment in one additional precinct, and for an additional scout car in precinct 13, where the crime rate has more than doubled since 1957.

I believe those are the more important features of the bill as it pertains to the Police Department.

With regard to the schools of the District of Columbia, the bill provides \$64,221,212. This is \$7.4 million over last year's appropriations. It will allow for 189 additional elementary school teachers, or 44 over the budget request, thus enabling the Department of Education for the first time to reach the desired pupil-teacher ratio of 30 to 1 in grades 1 to 6, 18 to 1 in the basic classes, and 30 to 1 in the kindergarten classes.

The bill provides for 122 additional junior high school teachers, which will enable the Department to reach the desired standard of 25 to 1 in the academic classes, 18 to 1 in the basic and social adjustment classes, and 18 to 1 in shop and home economics classes.

The appropriation provides for 70 additional senior high school teachers, thus enabling the Department to reach the desired ratio of 25 to 1 in the academic classes and 18 to 1 in shop and home economics classes.

The appropriation also provides for 29 teachers for the severely mentally retarded children of the District of Columbia. The budget request was for 4 teachers, but the committee increased that number by 25 teachers.

This is a program for children who are noneducable in the usual sense, because their IQ's range from 35 to 55. The program was initiated in 1954, and by 1960, five teachers were teaching 40 severely mentally retarded children. Last spring there was a waiting list of 228 such children ranging in age from 7 to 16 years. The committee felt it was about time to eliminate this waiting list and provide teachers for the entire group. We did so, and also provided 17 supporting personnel and nine vehicles in which the children are to be transported to and from the rooms, which will be set up in various schools throughout the city. Moreover, \$5,000 is included for simple books and mate-

rials to be used in the program of education of these children.

The bill provides a total appropriation of \$1,054,721—or an increase of \$247,423 over last year—for textbooks and supplies.

The bill provides an increase of \$38,000 in funds needed to pay the tuition of handicapped children in outside institutions because the public schools do not have facilities for the special training required. These moneys will provide tuition for 20 additional severely handicapped children, over the 126 children whose tuition was provided for last year.

The bill provides \$47,857 for an experimental program to deal with severely maladjusted pupils in the District of Columbia. It is estimated that about 80 of such pupils are in junior high schools and 40 in elementary schools. The desired pupil-teacher ratio being 10 to 1, the committee responded by recommending appropriations for 12 temporary teacher positions and 1 temporary counselor position, so that the so-called twilight program might get underway.

The bill provides money for 20 additional counselors, which, when added to the 68 counselors now in the public schools will make a total of 88 counselors. The request was for 41 counselors, but the committee felt that if 20 could be provided perhaps next year we could again give consideration to the matter of counselors.

In addition to these moneys, the committee recommended, in addition to the items allowed by the House, \$9,365,000 for the construction of three junior high schools and one elementary school, and \$30,000 for furniture and equipment in the elementary school to which I have just referred. It provided moneys for site purchases for one senior high school and two elementary schools, and preliminary planning moneys for one junior high school. It provided plans and specifications money for one elementary school, and plans and specifications and site purchase moneys for one elementary school and two junior high schools, making an overall total of \$15,570,000 for the items I have just mentioned.

Also recommended is \$114,600 for a continuation of the program for installing window guards in the windows of the schools of the District of Columbia. In the past fiscal year, 17,110 school windowpanes were broken.

The total program requires \$300,000 over a period of 3 years. This is the second year. We hope next year to complete the program of installing window guards in the schools.

As to the Department of Health, the bill carries an appropriation of \$46,934,389, which is \$4.1 million over last year's appropriation. This will permit a reorganization of the Department. It will also permit an increase in the rate for contract hospitals for in-patient care of \$2 per day, raising the present figure from \$32 to \$34. For out-patient visits, the bill provides an increase of 75 cents, making a total of \$5.75 rather than \$5, as at present.

The bill also provides for the restoration of the two full-time chaplains' positions at District of Columbia General Hospital.

It provides \$43,000 for the installation of a fence around District of Columbia General Hospital grounds, so as to reduce the present high rate of crimes against persons and personal property.

The committee recommends \$2.2 million for the care of District of Columbia prisoners at St. Elizabeths Hospital, heretofore financed by the Federal Government.

The bill provides \$23,796,973 for the Department of Welfare. This is \$3.3 million over the appropriation of the previous year. It provides for a reorganization of the Department, which has been long overdue. It provides for the installation of automatic data processing equipment. It provides 20 additional social workers in the Public Assistance Division. This will enable the Department to acquire Federal matching moneys on a 75-25 basis for 44 percent of the caseload. At present, the Department is able to acquire Federal matching moneys on a 75-25 basis for 21 percent of the caseload. The goal is to acquire Federal matching moneys on this basis for 71 percent of the caseload.

The average caseload per social worker, by filed positions, has been reduced from 183 in September 1961, to 118 in August of this year. With the additional 20 social workers provided herewith, the overall average is expected to drop to 90 or below by the end of fiscal year 1964.

The bill provides 72 additional positions at Junior Village where three additional cottages are ready for staffing. This is the full amount requested. It will reduce the ratio of children to staff members from 2.5 to 2.2.

The bill provides for 60 additional positions in District of Columbia Village to staff new construction and to provide for the increased population there. It provides \$248,000 for an additional cottage at Junior Village so as to initiate a replacement program at that institution.

The bill provides moneys to continue audit review of the aid to dependent children caseload, the general public assistance caseload, and the aid to the permanently and totally disabled caseload. It provides money for the investigation of 100 percent of cases at the point of intake, rather than 50 percent as at present.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the able Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If I may continue, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia in a moment. I have almost completed my reference to this item.

Mr. TALMADGE. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The bill would provide for a sample investigation of 1 percent of nonpublic assistance division surplus food cases. It would provide for a pilot reorganization of the surplus food distribution program. It would provide \$21,400 for the installation of exterior fire escapes for Junior Village cottages.

The bill would provide the Department with 32 additional social workers and supporting clerical personnel in the Child Welfare Division. The Director of the Department indicated to the committee that if he had certain tools

with which to work, he could reduce the population of Junior Village to a hard core of 500. When asked what the tools were, he stated that he needed additional social workers in the Child Welfare Division and an increase in the foster home rates for board and care.

The committee provided both tools, neither of which had been requested in the budget estimate. The budget request in connection with foster home care payments was that they be increased by \$3, from \$57 to \$60.

The bill provides, and the appropriations will allow, for increases in foster home payments, as follows: \$70 for infants up to 6 months, which is the present rate. The Director indicated that it was his opinion that no increase was necessary in this area.

But the Department will be able to pay \$60 a month instead of \$57, as at present, for children from 6 months through 5 years; \$65 a month, instead of \$57, as at present, for children 6 years through 11 years; \$75 a month, instead of \$57, as at present, for children 12 years and above; and \$95 a month for institutional care, instead of \$85, as at present.

So the committee has provided the Department with the tools which are said to be needed in order to reduce the population of Junior Village to the hard core. The population of Junior Village has been steadily increasing over the years, and it is felt that a very aggressive effort should be made to get children out of Junior Village and back into the homes of parents or relatives; and if this is impossible, to place them in foster homes.

For day care, \$75,459 is appropriated over the House allowance of \$55,900, to provide a total of \$131,359 for the day care program. An increase of \$5,000 is appropriated for Homemaker Service.

Mr. President, this completes my summarization of the facts as they pertain to appropriations, revenues, expenditures, and surpluses, and it completes my explanation of the appropriations for four major District of Columbia departments.

Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I shall yield first to the Senator from Georgia, inasmuch as he had asked me to yield earlier; then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TALMADGE. First, I compliment the distinguished Senator from West Virginia on his presentation of the Senate committee version of the bill. I have been a Member of the Senate a relatively short time—not quite 7 years. The Senator from West Virginia has demonstrated the most complete knowledge of a complex, complicated bill that I have seen in any Senate presentation to date. He has stated scores of figures as they relate to individuals and to moneys, including dollars and cents, completely from memory, without reference to notes. The Senator has demonstrated the most remarkable competence and knowledge of a bill that I have seen in my short period of time as a Senator.

Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator made reference to the ADC situation in the District of Columbia. I recall reading in the press some months ago of a detailed investigation which the Senator had completed. There was evidence that a great many persons were on the rolls without being entitled to be on them.

In my own State of Georgia, we had surplus commodity programs in some of the counties. Investigation revealed that a number of persons who were receiving commodities were not entitled to receive them.

We have seen similar situations in many other cities and States in the Union, where some persons, even to the third generation, have made careers out of public welfare, because it seemed to be more attractive to them to do that than to earn their own living.

I shall appreciate it if the Senator from West Virginia will inform the Senate what that investigation was and what corrective action the Senator's committee took.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the fall of 1961, the committee provided for an investigation of a sample of the ADC caseload. The investigation was begun in November 1961. It was joined in by the General Accounting Office, beginning in March 1962.

At the committee hearing last year, the Department, through its own investigators, and the General Accounting Office, through its investigators who had participated in the investigation, testified to the findings. The Comptroller General submitted to Congress two reports on the findings in the investigation of the Aid to Dependent Children category. One was a report submitted to the chairman of the two Appropriations Subcommittees on the District of Columbia. One was a special report submitted to the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. These reports showed that 59.7 percent of the cases investigated in that sample were ineligible, under the regulations. That was a scientific sample. It was not just an accidental sample; it was a scientific sample, and it constituted 5 percent of the cases in the ADC category, which at that time numbered 5,601. Not only were 59.7 percent of the cases found to be ineligible, but only 9.7 percent of the entire sample of 280 cases were found to involve no infractions whatsoever. Ninety-five cases, or 40.3 percent, were continued as eligible. But of the 95 cases that were continued as eligible, there were overpayments in 20 of these, and there were underpayments in 2.

The Comptroller General recommended that Congress, therefore, proceed to investigate the entire ADC caseload; and Congress made appropriations to carry out his recommendation. Since that date, the investigation has continued. Instead of 5,601 cases as of September 1961, and instead of 5,628 cases as of November 1961, when the investigation first got underway, there were only 3,823 cases in the ADC category as of October, a reduction of around 1,800 cases.

It was later decided to conduct a sample investigation of the General Public Assistance category. This was done, and the General Accounting Office was asked to participate in it, also. The reports came in; and it was found that 58.8 percent of the cases in the sample investigation were ineligible; and the Comptroller General recommended that this entire caseload be investigated, and the Congress so provided. The caseload in the GPA category has been reduced from 1,617 to 568 cases. These reductions are reflected in a drop in the overall caseload from 12,969, in September 1961, to 9,964 in October of this year—a reduction of 3,005 cases.

What have these savings amounted to? In only 2 years, from fiscal 1962 to fiscal 1964, the amount for total financial aid dropped from \$16,376,563 in the fiscal year 1962, to an estimated \$12,103,999 for the fiscal year 1964, a reduction in 2 years' time of over \$4 million annually. We are now proceeding with an investigation of the APTD caseload because a sampling of that caseload indicated that ineligibility findings amounted to 39.3 percent.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator for his detailed response. I believe all of us have deep sympathy with those who are financially in need of welfare and assistance, whoever they may be, and wherever they may be. I believe that Congress should insist that the provisions of law pertaining to cases apply, in order that tax money might not be thrown to the four corners of the earth on people who prefer assistance to work.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. I apologize for interrupting him. I did not realize that I was.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee for some 17 to 18 years, I have never found a Senator on that committee who has done a more thorough or a more conscientious job—and in some ways a more courageous job—than has the Senator from West Virginia. I wish to commend him for the work that he has done.

I wish to support him in the position he has taken. I believe he has gone into the situation with the utmost care.

I realize there is controversy in relation to a certain item of the budget on which a very distinguished former HEW Administrator does not agree with the Senator from West Virginia. But I point out to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and to other Senators who may be interested, that this budget, as I understand it, which has been gone into with such care by the Senator from West Virginia, includes 100 new policemen to provide a 3,000-man police force in the District of Columbia. It also provides for 25 additional Canine Corps man-dog teams, to allow a total of 100 man-dog teams. That provision is in connection with safety and security.

With regard to teachers, the bill provides for 462 additional teachers, of which 25 are for the mentally retarded.

As I understand, that is an amount over and above the actual budget request for teachers.

In addition, the bill provides for 338 new institutional helpers in the Welfare Department, expanding those departments to provide 2,799 welfare workers. So while the Senator from West Virginia and the committee have not provided for a certain amount of funds for certain care, the budget goes forward with a great increase in the safety provisions for the District of Columbia, the educational provision for the District of Columbia, and in the welfare provision.

As a member of the committee I merely wish to put in my word, for whatever it is worth, in commendation of the work that the Senator from West Virginia has done, and in which the committee by a 19-to-7 vote on this controversial issue supported him. I, for one, appreciate the work that the Senator from West Virginia has done.

I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether the figures I have just given are not correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The increase in the number of elementary teachers is 412.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I meant 412, which included 25 for the mentally retarded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be regarded as original text for the purposed amendment, and that no points of order be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and the committee amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc, as requested.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000"; in line 24, after the word "appropriated", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$20,800,000"; on page 3, line 2, after "(68 Stat. 101)", to strike out the word "and"; in line 3, after "(72 Stat. 183)", to insert "and the Act of August 27, 1963 (77 Stat. 130)", and in line 5, after the word "the", to strike out "sanitary sewage works fund" and insert "following funds: general fund, \$12,800,000 and sanitary sewage works fund, \$8,000,000".

On page 3, line 17, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "\$16,910,000" and insert "\$18,156,384"; in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$375,000"; in line 20, after the word "compensation", to insert "and \$250,000 shall remain available until December 31, 1964, for the purpose of conducting the 1964 Presidential election in the District of Columbia"; in line 23, after the word "and", to strike out "\$164,200" and insert "\$201,695"; in line 25, after the word "account", to strike out "\$23,900" and insert "\$31,900", and on page 4, line 1, after the word "and", to strike out "\$6,400" and insert "\$14,400".

On page 4, line 14, after the word "Commissioners", to strike out "purchase of fifty-four passenger motor vehicles including forty-four for replacement only for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year (but not in excess of \$100 per vehicle above such limitation) and ten for other re-

placement purposes", and in lieu thereof, to insert "purchase of seventy-two passenger motor vehicles (including sixty-one for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year but not in excess of \$100 per vehicle above such limitation) of which seventy are for replacement purposes"; in line 24, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$65,032,000" and insert "\$66,074,353"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$109,700" and insert "\$119,700"; on page 5, line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "\$3,355,000" and insert "\$3,369,695"; in line 5, after the word "account", to insert "\$1,688 from the water fund, and \$1,689 from the sanitary sewage works fund", and in line 13, after the word "Commissioners", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That the Fire Department is authorized to replace not to exceed five passenger-carrying vehicles annually whenever the cost of repair to any damaged vehicles exceeds three-fourths the cost of the replacement".

On page 5, line 18, after the word "including", to insert "purchase of sixteen passenger motor vehicles", and in line 22, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$61,670,000" and insert "\$64,221,212".

On page 6, line 11, after the word "Park", to strike out "\$8,853,000" and insert "\$9,076,881".

On page 6, line 19, after the word "Health", to strike out "\$66,316,000" and insert "\$71,203,242"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$32" and insert "\$34"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$5" and insert "\$5.75"; and on page 7, line 9, after the word "Columbia", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso "Provided further, That the authorization included under the heading 'Department of Public Health,' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for compensation of convalescent patients as an aid to their rehabilitation is hereby extended to the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation."

On page 7, line 16, after the word "including", to strike out "\$72,550" and insert "\$70,466"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "fifty" and insert "sixty"; in line 22, after the word "only", to strike out "\$12,138,000" and insert "\$12,427,853"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "\$8,365,000" and insert "\$8,470,453"; and in line 24, after the word "including", to strike out "\$3,418,300" and insert "\$2,804,300".

On page 8, line 6, after the word "only", to strike out "\$21,205,000" and insert "\$21,851,100"; in line 8, after the word "account", to strike out "\$7,053,000" and insert "\$7,220,300"; in line 9, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$4,050,000" and insert "\$4,165,990"; and in line 10, after the word "and", to strike out "\$6,200" and insert "\$32,760".

On page 8, line 22, after the word "fund", to strike out "\$148,900" and insert "\$149,000"; and in line 24, after the word "fund", to strike out the comma and "and" and \$64,400 shall be payable from the metropolitan area sanitary sewage works fund".

On page 9, line 12, after the word "addition", to insert "new junior high school in the vicinity of 13th and Van Buren Streets Northwest, new junior high school in the vicinity of 16th and Irving Streets Northwest, new junior high school in the vicinity of Bruce and Robinson Streets Southeast, new elementary school in the vicinity of Wheeler Road and Mississippi Avenue Southeast, new elementary school in the vicinity of 7th and Webster Streets Northwest, West End Branch Library, School Building at the Junior Village, Washington Cottage addition at the Maple Glen School and Industrial Arts Building at the Youth Center"; in line 23, after the word "Northeast", to insert "for conducting preliminary surveys for the construction of the Northwest Community and Mental Health Center, a juvenile facility, and the installation of a sprinkler system at

the District of Columbia Jail"; on page 10, line 7, after the word "addition", to strike out "and a"; in line 8, after the word "Village" to insert "Rabaut Junior High School, North Dakota and Kansas Avenues Northwest, Roper Junior High School, 48th and Meade Streets Northeast, Hine Junior High School replacement, Bunker Hill Elementary School addition, Southwest Branch Library, Engine Company Number 18 replacement, Dog Pound replacement, a children's cottage at the Junior Village, street cleaning tool houses replacement"; in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$358,000" and insert "\$388,000"; in line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$27,173,000" and insert "\$51,582,000"; at the beginning of line 18, to insert "\$7,200,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1964"; in line 19, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$10,737,500" and insert "\$10,835,400"; in line 20, after the word "fund", to insert "including \$80,000 for replacement of a school site"; in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "\$2,711,000" and insert "\$2,970,000"; in line 22, after the word "and", to strike out "\$10,052,000" and insert "\$8,674,000"; at the beginning of line 24, to strike out "\$257,000" and insert "\$1,643,100"; and on page 11, line 6, after the word "Grounds", to insert a colon and "Provided, That \$228,271 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay, Public Building Construction' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, is hereby rescinded: Provided further, That not to exceed \$49,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay, Washington Aqueduct,' in such Act shall be available for improvements at the Dalecarlia Plant".

On page 12, line 9, after the word "that", to strike out "one hundred and twenty-five" and insert "one hundred and seventy-one"; in line 10, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-eight"; and in line 11, after the word "Welfare", to insert "and eighteen for venereal disease investigators in the Department of Public Health".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and myself, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$71,203,214", and insert in lieu thereof "\$71,509,879".

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 240 Leg.]		
Alken	Clark	Hartke
Allott	Cooper	Hayden
Bartlett	Cotton	Hickenlooper
Bayh	Curtis	Hill
Beall	Dirksen	Hruska
Bennett	Dodd	Humphrey
Bible	Dominick	Inouye
Boggs	Douglas	Jackson
Brewster	Edmondson	Javits
Burdick	Ervin	Johnston
Byrd, Va.	Fong	Jordan, N.C.
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Jordan, Idaho
Cannon	Goldwater	Keating
Carlson	Gore	Kennedy
Case	Grueening	Kuchel
Church	Hart	Lausche

Magnuson	Mundt	Smith
Mansfield	Muskie	Sparkman
McCarthy	Nelson	Stennis
McClellan	Neuberger	Symington
McGovern	Pearson	Talmadge
McIntyre	Pell	Thurmond
McNamara	Prouty	Tower
Mechem	Proxmire	Walters
Metcalf	Randolph	Williams, N.J.
Miller	Ribicoff	Williams, Del.
Monroney	Russell	Yarborough
Morse	Saltonstall	Young, N. Dak.
Morton	Scott	Young, Ohio
Moss	Simpson	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I join the distinguished majority leader and distinguished minority leader, and the members of the Appropriations Committee, in lauding the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his knowledge and his work on this most important appropriation bill. I join with other Senators in their expression of the high respect we bear for the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

I personally decry the attacks that have been made upon him, trying to paint him as a heartless individual who does not care for the unfortunate. I know this is not so. I well recall a most significant day that I spent in West Virginia with the distinguished Senator when I was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I came to know the distinguished Senator and his concern and care for the unfortunate people, not only of West Virginia, but of the United States of America.

I also decry the idea that the distinguished Senator has done little for the District of Columbia. The gains in the entire field of welfare that are represented in this bill will always deserve the thanks of the people of the District of Columbia for what he has done, largely singlehandedly, with some help from others, in providing in this measure for more caseworkers, which is very laudatory.

In this measure he has also provided for expanded day care programs, which are also essential.

He has also made it possible to raise the amount of payments to foster home parents. This is absolutely essential. Therefore, Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has shown deep concern for the problems of the District.

I can understand the feeling, too, perhaps because his figures are so accurate,

that we should question not one item of the appropriation. However, I believe it is in order for us to look at the bill, and, if we have serious doubts as to one part of the measure, to bring that issue up on the floor.

I too am concerned with the problems of welfare. That concern goes back to my duties as Governor of Connecticut. As I look around the floor, I see many men who have served as Governors of their States. I see the distinguished Senators from Wyoming, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Alaska. The Chamber is peopled with men who have served as Governors of their States.

I do not believe that during our term in public office, as we tried to take care of the problems of the people of our State, there was a problem which caused us as much concern and worry as the problem of welfare.

It cost a great deal of money. Legislatures were never happy. There was fraud. We always had the problem of a deficiency budget. It was an open-end appropriation. At the beginning of every legislative session we found ourselves having to go before the legislature to ask for many millions of dollars more.

After the President appointed me Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I recall appearing before the Committee on Finance under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd]. During the colloquy that took place between the members of the Finance Committee and myself, I pointed out to the committee that one of my concerns as Secretary of that Department would be to try to bring a fresh, new approach to all the problems of welfare in the Nation.

I recognized that for 30 years, beginning in the 1930's, the United States had started on a program which was without imagination and without change. I realized that the nature of our country had changed and that the nature of our problems had changed. I promised the Committee on Finance that once the first legislative session was over, I would devote my time to trying to come up with a new program in the field of public welfare for the United States.

To that end I gathered together on a voluntary basis a group of leading citizens from across the land to help me devise and formulate a new program in this field.

This was most important, because in the United States today approximately 7 million persons are on relief. In the United States today we spend on all forms of assistance approximately \$4,800 million. That is a staggering amount of money.

I recognized, as the Senator from West Virginia recognized, that there was fraud in public assistance programs, and that fraud must be closed off and fraud must be eliminated from the welfare programs.

I recognized that we were entering into a period in which there were in some instances three generations of one family on relief. That would never do.

I recognized that there had to be new changes. Some of those changes I could make administratively. There were two orders that we handed down administratively which did not require legislation.

The first order I issued as Secretary was to the effect that every State in the Union had to provide a unit in its welfare department which would locate deserting husbands. One of the great burdens that came upon the States and the Federal Government was caused by husbands deserting their families and crossing State lines. We asked that every State cooperate with every other State to make sure that we could locate those deserting husbands, and make them pay for the obligation of supporting their children.

The second thing that was done administratively was to require every State in the Union to set up an effective fraud division within its own welfare department. In that division rules and regulations could be set up so that we would have an opportunity to discover fraud and root it out.

Following this, there was much that Congress had to do if we were to move the whole program of welfare off the track of a mere handout, and off the track of being merely a conduit between the State or Federal Treasury and the recipients of relief. We recognized what had to be done was a matter, first, of prevention; second, rehabilitation, if prevention was too late or impossible.

There was presented to Congress a new program in the entire field of welfare. In 1962, this program received the support of Congress. Both Houses overwhelmingly voted a new approach in the entire field of welfare.

Now we come to the District of Columbia.

I, for one, believe that we who are in the Senate have a deep obligation to the people of the District of Columbia. We are here practically 12 months a year. This year we will be here 12 months. We have homes in our States. My home in Connecticut remains unoccupied for almost 12 months. I have a home in the District of Columbia. I pay taxes in the District of Columbia. Other Members of the Senate live in the District of Columbia or in its environs. Their children go to school here. We have an obligation not only to the United States and to the people of our own States, but also to the people of the District.

The city of Washington should be the Nation's pride. Let us be frank with one another. The city of Washington, D.C., happens to be the Nation's shame. Year in and year out children of our constituents come to the city of Washington. Washington should be held up to them as an example of what a city should be like. It is the Nation's Capital. This is where the children come to learn and observe, so they can go home and follow the great history of the United States as they have observed it in the Capital of the Nation.

What do we send back to our 50 States? What is found in the District of Columbia? We find that the District of Columbia leaves some children hungry. We find that the District of Columbia can be indifferent. We allow the District of Columbia to be in a position where there could be written in today's Washington Daily News a story like this:

Memorial to a Father of 11—His Death Was Economically Sound.

The article, written by Tom Kelly, reads, in part:

You might say Sonny Cooper threw himself into the Anacostia River or you might say he was strangled by redtape.

Last night the dead Mr. Cooper, 33, became a symbol.

He never had a job making more than \$70 a week and he seldom had one paying that. He had a wife and 11 children. He was a Washington Negro.

The worst thing you could say about him was that he drank a lot and sometimes he beat his wife.

The best thing you could say was that he loved his kids so much he ran away and left them.

With Sonny at home the family got his wages, \$35 a week, \$70 a week or nothing a week.

With Sonny away the family was eligible for welfare aid, \$77 a week, every week.

DEPARTURE

So a couple of months ago Sonny took his clothes and left. And when he could find nowhere to put his clothes he threw them in the gutter. And when he could find nowhere to put himself he threw himself in the river.

Mr. President, it is sad, in the United States, when the 11 children of a man who drowns in a river can have aid, because the Government will provide for those children, but the same Government will not provide for those hungry children when the father is alive.

With some 5,600,000 in the United States unemployed, with many people having exhausted their unemployment compensation, we must do something for the children of unemployed parents who have exhausted their unemployment compensation.

We recognized in 1961 that a program was needed in the United States so that a father need not have to leave his family, need not have to stay away from home, so that his family could receive aid. We recognized that one of the needs of the country was to keep families together. Because we recognized this need Congress in 1961 enacted a new program, one which provided for aid to dependent children of an unemployed parent. That act provided that if a State adopted a program to provide for the children of an unemployed parent, the Federal Government would provide matching funds as it did when it provided aid in other cases of dependent children. As a result of that program, the following 15 States now have the program:

Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maryland, Massachusetts, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Utah, Washington, and West Virginia.

It is interesting to note that West Virginia and Connecticut, represented, respectively, by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] and me, adopted this program. I say that what is good enough for West Virginia and good enough for Connecticut is good enough for the people of the District of Columbia.

But although only 15 States have adopted this program, 33 States have a general assistance program. That is, if there are children of unemployed parents who are hungry, under the general assistance programs of 33 States, the State, county, or city may then enter

the picture and take care of the hungry children of unemployed parents.

So an overwhelming number of States in the Nation have a way of taking care of children who are hungry, even though their parents are employable but are without jobs. This is not true in the District of Columbia, because the District of Columbia not only provides no aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, neither does the District provide general assistance aid to the hungry children of unemployed parents.

As Senators, we have no right to pass laws to solve the problems of our own individual States while at the same time we exclude from the benefits of the program the people who live in the District of Columbia.

What does my amendment seek to do? First, the amendment I propose would raise the welfare appropriation in the District of Columbia appropriation bill by the sum of \$306,637. I should tell the Senate that this sum would cover 6 months. The reason it covers 6 months is that only a little more than 6 months remain in the present fiscal year. I should say to the Senate, in all candor, that should the program be adopted for an entire year, the total cost, both local and Federal, would amount to some \$2,500,000. Therefore, I do not wish to mislead the Senate by saying that the program would cost \$306,000. It would cost \$306,000 for the remaining 6 months; but we should recognize that were the program to be adopted for an entire year, the cost would be in the neighborhood of \$2,500,000, including both local and Federal contributions.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has made the point that the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is low. He states that the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is 3½ percent, and that we should not concern ourselves to provide assistance in a situation in which there is such a small percentage of people out of work.

A child who is hungry is just as hungry if only his father is unemployed in a city, as if 1,000 or 2,000 fathers or mothers were unemployed in a city.

While the distinguished Senator from West Virginia talks about a low rate of unemployment in the District of Columbia, we find the following situation: The program in the State of Kansas provides aid for only 34 families. Oklahoma has a program aiding only 28 families. Oregon has its program for 235 families. The State of Washington has its program for 740 families. If a program like this is good enough for the State of Washington, I do not know, for the life of me, why it should not be good enough for Washington, D.C.

We are confronted with the problem of the treatment of our youth. Are we concerned with hungry children? Do we feel that an obligation rests upon Congress to be concerned with youngsters in our own backyard? Are we concerned with families who surround the august Capitol of the United States? Or shall we pass on the other side of the street, wearing blinders, not recognizing the fact that hungry children live in

Washington, the Nation's Capital, children who need our help and support?

The problem is even more serious. I am aware of the feeling that has been expressed by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia concerning the so-called man-in-the-house standard. But the amendment I propose would take care of some 490 families for 6 months, and of these 312 have women as heads of households, and only 178 have men as heads of households. So we are not concerned with just unemployed men.

What is the anomalous position in which the Senate finds itself if we accept the position of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia? Let me cite two examples: A woman is a prostitute and has three or four illegitimate children. She is not employable. Who knows how many more illegitimate children she may have? Under the present law in the District of Columbia, that woman can receive relief.

Suppose another case. A woman's husband is dead or is in jail or has deserted her. The woman is proud. Her children are not illegitimate. Her children are her own legitimate children. She wants to get off relief. So she gets a relative, perhaps her mother, to move in to take care of the children and she takes a training program and learns to be a seamstress or a typist. She secures employment as a seamstress in a store, or she works as a typist in an office. A time comes when she may lose her job. She has those mouths to feed back home. She is "employable." After 3 months, if she cannot obtain work, she and her children are hungry and destitute, and even with the improvement made in this bill, she and her children would be ineligible for relief.

What kind of system is it that enables a prostitute mother of illegitimate children, who has no self-respect, who is unwilling to do something for herself and her children, to receive aid from the money which Congress appropriates, but which says to a woman who wants to better herself, "Madam, you are employable. It is unfortunate that you learned to be a seamstress or a typist; but since you have a skill, even though you cannot find a job, it is too bad; we are going to cut you off from receiving aid, and you must shift for yourself."

If there is any way to encourage women to become prostitutes, it is under such a system as prevails in the District of Columbia. The conscience of the Nation cries out against it. The time has come for us as Senators to recognize our obligation to the children and the people of the District of Columbia. The time has come for the Senate to recognize that we have an obligation toward them.

Of course we must have hardheads—and I am all for that; and we must eliminate waste—and I am all for that; and we must make sure that there is no fraud in connection with these welfare programs—and I am all for that, and I commend the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership in regard to all these items—yet I cannot agree when the distinguished Senator from West Virginia advocates a program which would make it impossible for us to take care of a decent woman or a decent man who can-

not find a job, but who wants a job, and under the regulations would be required to report to the U.S. Employment Service office and be required to make himself or herself available for a job.

I approve of the provision which reduces the number of cases which each caseworker will handle, for it makes it possible for the cases to be followed up, so that malingerers or fakers cannot take advantage of the program, and so that those who refuse to take the jobs offered them or found for them will be ineligible.

The time has come for us to face not only our obligations in West Virginia, Connecticut, and the other States of the Union, but also the obligation which each one of us owes every man, woman, and child in the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. As Senators know, I have been the mayor of a fairly good sized city—Philadelphia—where, during my term of office, approximately the same welfare problems existed that the District of Columbia has.

For the past several years, I have been serving as chairman of the Manpower and Employment Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. At present, we are engaged in a massive study of the causes of unemployment and the question of whether the normal workings of the market, plus the legislation already enacted, are likely to curtail the number of unemployed.

I regretfully have come to the conclusion—although those hearings are not quite over—that in the United States unemployment is going to increase, not decrease, and that in the near future massive measures will be needed in order to bring unemployment back to anywhere near the level at which it should be.

When I was the mayor of Philadelphia, thousands of unemployed men and women, particularly men, were deserting their families because at that time if there was a man in the house who could be employed, the family could not obtain public assistance.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania will agree that it is better to have a father in the house, even though he is unemployed, than to have a family without a father, because the father has deserted his family.

Mr. CLARK. I do not believe such a contention could seriously be questioned. To me, it is extraordinary that there is opposition to this amendment.

In Pennsylvania—until the law was changed; it has since been changed—we found families that were breaking up because the father would leave the family, rather than have the children go without adequate food or clothing.

So I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the fight he is making in this regard, and I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

I am a member of the triumvirate of Senators who are sponsoring the amendment.

In the District of Columbia Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I offered the amendment, and in the full Appropriations Committee I supported the amendment when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered it. I am happy to be a cosponsor of the amendment in the Senate Chamber.

In my opinion, everything the Senator from Connecticut has said in support of the amendment is eminently sound, and hardly needs to be developed further.

I also agree with what the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has said about the desirability of maintaining stable family relationships. It seems to me that is an overriding consideration, and not only is one of humanity, but also is one of commonsense. It is highly desirable to maintain parents in the home, rather than somewhere else in order to qualify for relief. That is obviously most desirable.

As for the amount of tax funds required, certainly that will be less if the parents are maintained in the family home, rather than if we were to continue the man-in-the-house rule.

In that connection, I call attention to a study published by the Washington chapter of the National Association of Social Workers and the Commission on Human Resources. The study is entitled "Public Welfare Crisis in the Nation's Capital." In the report it is pointed out that the cost of maintaining a child in the Junior Village is \$185 a month, and that all of that amount is paid with District of Columbia funds, and that the cost of maintaining a child in a foster home is \$57 a month, for clothing and medical care. But the report shows that the cost of maintaining a child in a home receiving an ADC grant in October 1962 was \$32.43, and that more than half of that is reimbursed with District of Columbia funds; but this amount is insufficient to maintain a child in his own home. However, a comparison of these figures makes clear the high cost to the taxpayers of having the Department handle dependent children in this category.

There is no argument, so far as I can determine, except one that the present arrangement is better than to encourage immorality—although I think the reverse is true, in the long run—or one based on a desire to make the District of Columbia unattractive to colored migrants from the South. I do not go along with either of those arguments.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey served on the subcommittee and heard the testimony. Although we talk about fraud and about "the man in the house," is it not true that the majority of cases involve households in which there is not a man, but in which the head of the household is an employable woman? So those cases do not involve a question of a man who comes to the back door at 11 p.m. These cases involve the problem of employable women whose husbands are dead or have deserted—employable women who are being excluded from assistance after 3 months.

The figures I have indicate that for the 6-month period, of 490 families, 312 have a woman as the head of the household. On an annual basis, of the 1,105 families involved, 700 have a woman as the head of the household, and 400 have a man as the head of the household.

So we are discussing a situation in which women who are self-respecting and who wish to work and who have trained themselves for jobs, cannot find jobs; and suddenly we find that we may actually be forcing those women to engage in prostitution in order to get bread or shoes for their children, because under the present situation in the District of Columbia, the children of such families are treated differently from the children in families in other parts of the United States.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is quite correct. The "man-in-the-house" rule applies to both unemployed but employable women and unemployed but employable men.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I do not want to close these remarks without paying my sincere respects to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I recognize that this year the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has gone far to straighten out some of the main problems in connection with the District of Columbia budget, to make it better for families with children, and to eliminate fraud. His actions have improved the care for children in foster homes, with the result that there will be more children living with families, instead of living at Junior Village. In addition, his action in reducing the number of cases per worker will make it easier to help families and also to check on abuses. In addition, his action to provide more help for day care would make it possible for women who wish to work to have a place for their children to stay while they were employed.

So it is with deep regret that I find that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia—who has done so much with this budget, and has been so constructive, and has done so much for the District of Columbia—has failed to take the further step which would make it possible to bring justice to the young children of unemployed men and women in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield briefly to me, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut? I have been engaged in the TFX hearings.

I believe the welfare concept for which the Senator is contending is the right and necessary one, and I shall have the privilege of supporting his amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Iowa for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. Do I correctly understand that the main thrust of the Senator's amendment is to provide for the situation which has been written up in the local newspapers as the "man-in-the-house" problem?

Mr. RIBICOFF. No, that is the least I seek to accomplish. This has been dramatized as the "man-in-the-house" rule and I am not proposing to eliminate this rule. What I am interested in is taking care of the problems of needy children. As I pointed out to the Senate, the majority of families involved here are families in which the head of the household is a woman who has been employable but is out of work. The "man-in-the-house" rule would not be changed as to her. Of course there would be a modification of the rule with respect to male heads of households, since children of unemployed fathers would be eligible, but that is only a part of the amendment and not the same thrust, since that applies to a minority of the cases.

There is a man-in-the-house rule in the State I represent, and there is no difficulty in having both the "man-in-the-house" rule and a program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. So that is not the main thrust of my amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I did not make my question clear. Is the main thrust of the amendment directed at the problems which arise as a result of the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia, without which rule the Senator from Connecticut would probably find it not necessary to offer his amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Not at all. The main thrust of the amendment is to take care of the children of the employable mother or father, or both, who are unemployed for more than 3 months.

Mr. MILLER. Would the Senator say that even if the District of Columbia did not have the man-in-the-house rule, his amendment would still be offered?

Mr. RIBICOFF. It would most certainly be offered, because even without the "man-in-the-house" rule, there is a grave problem in the District of Columbia. A self-respecting mother might train for a job, and then find herself out of work. In that case the family cannot receive aid. My amendment would correct that situation without any change in the man-in-the-house rule. But in the same District of Columbia if we have a prostitute who is not trained for a job, her children would be paid.

Mr. MILLER. One final question: Is it the Senator's point that all the talk regarding the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia has absolutely no bearing and no relevance whatsoever to the amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator has spoken of relevance. I cannot say it has no relevance. I would have offered the amendment even if we did not have the man-in-the-house rule. This has been dramatized as the man-in-the-house rule, and what I have sought to do is to set the record straight, to correct those who believe that what we are trying to do is to eliminate the man-in-the-house rule. If the Senator from

West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would agree, I would be willing to alter the amendment to provide that the man-in-the-house rule still applies to these families and to extend aid only to those families in which there is no man in the house but where a woman is head of the household. We would not be bothered with the problem of the man-in-the-house rule at all.

However, I believe there is another question here. Sometimes there may be an unemployed man legitimately in the house. That would not be the case of a man who is not the legitimate father. I would also want to cover the children of an unemployed father living in the home.

Mr. MILLER. I share the concern of the Senator from Connecticut over what to do about the children, but at the same time I do not want to be a party to an amendment or to a law, which would be a vehicle for what many of us consider to be an immoral situation. I do not believe we have to have one or the other. Apparently there are some who would close their eyes to the question of the morality of a situation and say, "It is all right so long as the children are taken care of." I do not believe we have to be led into that conclusion at all. We should be in a position to do something about the morality of a situation, and at the same time take care of the children.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We can. It is my contention that what we are doing now in the District of Columbia leads more surely to immorality than failure to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I should first like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, apropos his last statement, whether he would enlighten me as to how the Senator arrived at his last statement?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I shall be pleased to do so. I am sorry the Senator was not in the Chamber when I cited two examples.

Let us assume the case of the household of a woman who is a prostitute with four illegitimate children. They are living in that household together. She is not employable. Under District of Columbia procedure, her children would receive aid.

Let us now consider the case of a woman living in the District of Columbia with four legitimate children. Let us say that her mother is living with her. She brings the grandmother into the home to take care of the children, and the mother goes into a training program. She learns to be a typist or a seamstress. She goes to a department store and gets a job. She works 4, 5, or 6 months. The grandmother is taking care of the children. The mother brings in a week's pay. She then loses her job. She is out of work for 3 months and cannot find another job. If after 3 months she were still without work, she would receive no payment from the District of Columbia Welfare Department; whereas, under the same circumstances, a prostitute with four illegitimate children would receive assistance from the District of Columbia.

For the life of me, I do not believe that is fair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator has cited the hypothetical case of a woman out of work for 3 months; and who would receive no welfare payment from the District of Columbia?

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct; after 3 months.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I point out that she can qualify for unemployment compensation.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But she may use up unemployment compensation. The Senator from West Virginia did provide in the bill that a woman out of work for 1 month would not be shut off. The Senator from West Virginia amended that provision to allow her to be on relief for 3 months, but later her unemployment compensation would be used up. She would receive her unemployment compensation, but if she could not find a job after the 34 weeks allowed—assuming she qualified for maximum benefits—she would receive no assistance. She has, therefore, only one other thing to do and that is to go out on the street and "hustle" for her money.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I appreciate the kind remarks which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut made during the presentation and explanation of his amendment. I am sorry that I must oppose the amendment. I recognize that the Senator was a distinguished Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before he became a Senator. I can appreciate that he has great knowledge of the welfare programs. I recognize his leadership in the field of public welfare.

I have the same high admiration and respect for him as he has stated he possesses for me. I recognize also that he enjoyed a very distinguished career in the arena of politics before he became Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I know he was one of the most popular Governors of a great State.

I recognize that the Senator's support of the amendment naturally carries great weight, because I believe we all feel that the Senator is an authority on this subject. His service as Governor of the State of Connecticut exposed him, in a considerable degree, to the problems which confront welfare recipients.

I cannot say that I have been a Governor of a State. I cannot say that I have been a Secretary of one of our departments in the executive branch. But I come to the Senate not wholly unexposed to the subject of public welfare. I served as a member of the House of Delegates of West Virginia. I served as a member of the West Virginia Senate. I served on the finance committees of both houses in the West Virginia Legislature. I was in a position there to deal with public assistance matters.

I served in the House of Representatives of the United States.

I have held more legislative offices than any other individual in the history of my State, and, therefore, I, too, have had some exposure to the subject of public welfare, although I am quick to admit

that I am not as deeply grounded in the subject as is the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I recognize this fact, and I highly respect his opinions generally. However, we are dealing today with a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia. As chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I feel that I am fairly conversant with the subject as it pertains to the Federal city.

This is not a position for which I asked. It is not a chairmanship which I wanted. But I am doing with all my might the task that fell upon me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will withhold for a little while, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Very well.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I conducted an entire day of hearings on the proposed AFDC-UP program.

The subcommittee sat for 15 days. The record of the hearings is in three volumes, and contains 2,902 pages. One entire volume is on the Department of Welfare. So we do not lack information upon which to base our decision today.

I am as deeply concerned about hungry children as is any other Member of this body. I expect I know as much about being a hungry child as any other Member of this body knows, having been an orphan at the age of 10 months.

I recognize the emotional appeal which is embodied in this issue and in the amendment. I think the facts, however, appeal to the intelligence rather than only to the emotions, and I have sought to find the facts.

The issue was before the House of Representatives last year, and the House turned down the request. It was presented to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee turned down the request.

This proposal was presented again this year to the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and the subcommittee turned it down. It was turned down by the Senate Committee on Appropriations by a vote of 19 to 7; and I had one proxy in my pocket which I did not use. Had I used the proxy, there would have been 20 votes against the amendment.

The great drive is on to push the amendment through. The House has already heard testimony on the A budget, but has not yet heard testimony on the B budget, so this item has not been presented to the House this year. An effort is being made to have the amendment adopted in the Senate, it evidently being the feeling that if the Senate adopts the amendment the battle will be won. Some Senators will vote today without having heard the debate. Some will vote for the amendment because of their having received telegrams and letters from organized groups within their own States, many of which know little or nothing about the facts regarding welfare in the District of Columbia.

The subject is perhaps not fully understood by any of us. As an example of what I mean, one of my colleagues who voted for the amendment in the subcommittee and in the full Committee on

Appropriations indicated that such a program was in effect in his State. I assured him it was not in effect in his State. He said it was. I said, "You had better inform the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, because the Department is unaware of it."

I saw him later. I said, "I have checked again. Your State does not participate in this program." He said, "Oh, yes; my State participates in the ADC program. We have an ADC program." I said, "Of course you have. The District of Columbia has an aid to dependent children program, but we are talking about aid to dependent children of unemployed parents."

The Senator cast his vote for the amendment, feeling that the program was in effect in his own State, whereas it was not. So there is a great deal of misunderstanding about this issue. Yet, everybody seems to want to get into the act. Labor organizations have contacted Senators, I am informed. Social worker organizations have been active in urging Senators to support the amendment. Some people have axes to grind; others simply imagine they are working in a righteous cause which, unlike a buckwheat cake, has only one side.

As I have said, the amendment has its appeal and it will be popular to vote for it, but like the buckwheat cake, the proposal has two sides and I shall now attempt to present my views in opposition to it.

The Senator from Connecticut, to my regret, referred to the story that was in the Washington Daily News of today. A similar story was in the press last week. It was the story about Sonny Cooper. I do not think it is apropos at all to the subject of this debate. I have thought about it over the weekend. I did not feel that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut would refer to this article in the newspaper, but, inasmuch as he has so referred, I, too, must deal with it briefly. The article states:

The best thing you could say was that he loved his kids so much he ran away and left them.

He loved his kids so much he ran away and left them—in my judgment, that is an utterly ridiculous and preposterous and asinine statement. A man who loves his children is not going to run away and leave them.

The news story continues:

With Sonny at home the family got his wages, \$35 a week, \$70 a week or nothing a week.

Why? Why did his family receive nothing a week while he was at home?

With Sonny away the family was eligible for welfare aid, \$77 a week, every week.

So a couple of months ago Sonny took his clothes and left. And when he could find nowhere to put his clothes, he threw them in the gutter. And when he could find nowhere to put himself, he threw himself in the river.

Men who feel a responsibility for their children do not throw themselves into the river.

The article continues:

Last night they had a memorial service for Sonny at the Bethlehem Baptist Church, on Howard Road SE. It is a large, neat, new

building with wall-to-wall carpeting and a middle-class Negro congregation.

On the platform were nine well-dressed, well-educated men, seven Negro, two white. They were representatives of the church, civil rights groups, labor and a Southeast settlement house.

Julius Hobson, of CORE, stood at the microphone and said that Sonny Cooper was a victim of his surroundings.

"His story is the story of most American Negro males," he said.

Let me tell Senators a little about his story. Willie Cooper had been arrested 18 times. He was arrested in 1947 for being disorderly. He was arrested in 1951, for being drunk and disorderly. He was arrested in early 1953, for being drunk. He was arrested again in the fall of that same year for being drunk. He was arrested again in December for being drunk. He was arrested for an assault with a deadly weapon on Aaron Cooper.

I do not know who Aaron Cooper is. I do not know whether it was Sonny's brother or his father or one of his children, but Aaron Cooper was the complainant.

Sonny was arrested on May 12, 1954, for being disorderly in the house, and the complainant was his own wife, Virginia.

He was arrested in 1956 for being disorderly. He was arrested in early 1958, and charged with assault with a deadly weapon. The deadly weapon was a skillet, and the complainant was his wife. He was arrested again 3 months later for being drunk in the house, and the complainant was his wife.

The other complaints I shall not read. I hold in my hand a police report, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Investigation revealed that Willie Cooper, Negro, age 33 years, and Virginia Elizabeth Cooper, Negro, age 39 years, residing at 505 Florida Avenue NE., were married October 7, 1947, at 1113 Ninth Street NW., by Rev. B. J. Pogue. Marriage license number 315-532.

Virginia Cooper stated that she was separated from her husband in June 1963, at the time they were evicted from premises 1120 Stevens Road SE. She stated that the cause of their separation was the eviction as her husband was a drunkard and refused to work. He last worked at 4400 Connecticut Avenue NW., as a laborer for the Thomas E. Clarke Plumbing Co., and he would only work 2 or 3 days out of a week. She believed this was in March 1963. When he worked she received from \$35 to \$40 a week.

Virginia Cooper stated she last saw her husband in the early part of July 1963. She moved to the present address at the time of her eviction. She is presently receiving \$353 a month. She has three bedrooms at the present address and the rent is \$135 a month. This rent is paid to Kenneth Kennedy, 7th and Florida Avenue NE. She stated on this past Tuesday, November 12, 1963, the house was auctioned off and she did not know the name of the new owner. She was advised to stay there as the house was going to be renovated.

Virginia Cooper gave the following information about her family. Her mother, Matilda Brandon, Negro, age 63 years, residing at 664 Kenilworth Terrace NE., is living with her daughter, Sarah Brandon, Negro, age 31 years, mother of seven children and single, are living at that address, all on public welfare. She has another sister, Mildred Howard, Negro, 37 years, 3726 Foote Street

NE., residing at that address with her husband, George Howard. They both are on public welfare.

Virginia Cooper has 11 children, ages running from 2 to 15 years, with one child age 11 years confined to District of Columbia General Hospital. The oldest daughter, Betty Cooper, age 15 years, is presently pregnant, by Fred Smith, Negro, age 14 years, who lives somewhere on Fourth Street SE.

The caseworkers for this family is Mrs. Henry, Board of Public Welfare. Mrs. Cooper stated she was notified of the death of her husband on November 4, 1963, and she identified her husband by a scar on his face as he was decomposed. She stated that when she last saw him he was not despondent, but was an alcoholic.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I quote extracts from it:

Virginia Cooper stated that she was separated from her husband in June 1963 at the time they were evicted from premises 1120 Stevens Road SE. She stated that the cause of their separation was the eviction as her husband was a drunkard and refused to work. He last worked at 4400 Connecticut Avenue NW., as a laborer for the Thomas E. Clarke Plumbing Co., and he would only work 2 or 3 days out of a week.

So, his wife stated that Sonny was a drunkard and refused to work. Is this the image of a man who was "a victim of his surroundings" or does it appear that he was the victim of himself? Is this the image of a man who loves his children, or is it the picture of a man who displayed little sense of responsibility toward them?

Here was a man who refused to work for his wife and children. Yet, it is said that he loved them so much that he left home, threw his clothes in the gutter and threw himself in the river.

Reading from the report:

Virginia Cooper stated she last saw her husband in the early part of July 1963—

Five months ago—

She is presently receiving \$353 a month. Virginia Cooper gave the following information about her family. Her mother, Matilda Brandon, Negro, age 63, residing at 664 Kenilworth Terrace NE., is living with her daughter, Sarah Brandon, Negro, age 31, mother of seven children and single, are living at that address, all on public welfare. She has another sister, Mildred Howard, Negro, 37 years, 3726 Foote Street NE., residing at that address with her husband, George Howard. They both are on public welfare.

The case worker was Mrs. Henry. Mrs. Cooper was notified of her husband's death on November 4, 1963. She identified him by a scar on his face, as he was decomposed. She stated that when she last saw him he was not despondent, but was an alcoholic.

So, there are the two sides to the story. One can take either side he chooses, depending upon his viewpoint. I am sorry to have to make any remarks about this case, but I did not inject it into the discussion.

The Senator from Connecticut said something that is often said by some people in the District of Columbia about the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee: What is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia. The Senator from Connecticut said, "What is good enough for the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut is good enough for the District of Columbia." The critics

do not always say that. They usually say: "What is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia."

Let us see. West Virginia has a ceiling on ADC payments of \$165 a month.

Is what is good enough for West Virginia good enough for the District of Columbia? There is no ceiling in the District of Columbia on ADC payments. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a table showing

the amounts of payments made to 102 families that receive the highest welfare payments in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Data on 102 aid to dependent children families receiving highest grants during June 1963

Total persons in assistance unit	Number of children	Length of time on assistance continuously since most recent opening		Number of months on assistance prior to most recent opening	Amount of grant received in June 1963	Retail value of surplus food received in June 1963	Total persons in assistance unit	Number of children	Length of time on assistance continuously since most recent opening		Number of months on assistance prior to most recent opening	Amount of grant received in June 1963	Retail value of surplus food received in June 1963
		Yrs.	Mos.						Yrs.	Mos.			
8	6	3	1	0	\$564	\$27.77	9	8	3	10	2	\$305	\$27.77
7	6	6	6	0	410	24.67	9	8	11	6	12	305	27.77
14	13	1	9	0	391	45.25	10	9	2	3	166	305	45.25
13	11	2	11	2	374	45.25	9	7	5	3	12	304	34.96
6	4	4	4	0	362	20.58	9	7	2	9	0	304	34.96
12	11	1	1	0	359	45.25	9	7	2	4	1	304	34.96
12	10	2	8	9	358	45.25	11	10	5	7	42	304	45.25
12	11	1	11	42	356	45.25	10	9	2	5	50	303	34.96
12	11	1	11	0	353	45.25	10	9	2	10	55	303	34.96
12	10	3	1	15	352	45.25	10	8	2	10	0	303	(1)
5	4	4	9	0	350	17.48	9	8	6	10	0	303	34.96
11	10	5	4	0	345	45.25	10	9	1	9	18	303	34.96
4	3	5	3	1	344	17.48	10	8	2	8	0	302	34.96
10	9	1	1	36	339	34.96	11	3	2	10	0	302	(1)
11	10	1	11	0	337	(1)	4	10	3	2	0	301	(2)
7	6	4	8	5	336	34.96	10	8	1	9	19	299	34.96
13	2	3	0	8	334	24.67	9	8	7	7	44	299	34.96
10	9	6	3	36	334	45.25	10	9	1	4	44	299	(2)
10	8	4	1	0	333	34.96	10	9	1	4	0	298	34.96
11	10	4	9	5	332	34.96	9	7	1	9	0	298	34.96
11	10	5	105	331	45.25	331	9	7	1	6	68	298	34.96
10	8	3	16	328	34.96	34.96	10	9	1	7	0	297	34.96
10	9	2	4	4	327	(2)	10	9	8	3	0	297	34.96
3	2	1	6	0	327	(3)	9	8	5	3	7	296	34.96
14	12	7	2	42	327	45.25	10	8	8	9	24	296	(2)
10	9	5	1	0	327	34.96	11	10	4	9	0	294	(3)
11	10	2	1	11	325	45.25	6	5	5	6	47	294	24.67
7	6	2	7	7	323	27.77	10	9	1	7	0	293	34.96
10	9	2	9	49	321	34.96	9	8	2	6	52	293	27.77
10	9	4	7	27	321	34.96	9	8	9	4	0	293	34.96
10	8	2	8	0	320	34.96	9	8	5	1	0	293	34.96
9	8	5	10	0	320	27.77	9	7	1	2	6	292	(2)
11	9	2	7	0	318	45.25	8	6	2	1	15	292	34.96
5	4	2	8	8	318	17.48	9	7	7	11	4	292	(2)
10	9	5	9	34	315	34.96	10	9	2	11	15	291	34.96
10	9	5	1	34	315	34.96	10	9	1	3	0	291	34.96
10	8	9	10	49	315	34.96	9	8	3	6	0	291	34.96
10	8	11	0	0	314	34.96	11	10	1	2	0	290	(1)
11	9	3	6	0	313	45.25	11	9	3	1	0	290	45.25
9	7	3	1	25	310	34.96	9	7	4	11	0	289	27.77
10	9	3	0	0	309	34.96	8	7	2	1	92	289	24.67
9	8	6	5	0	309	27.77	9	8	16	8	0	288	27.77
10	9	4	6	2	309	34.96	8	6	5	8	0	288	24.67
11	10	12	2	0	309	45.25	5	4	4	2	0	288	17.48
10	9	1	9	24	309	34.96	9	8	4	14	0	287	27.77
10	8	3	2	0	308	34.96	9	8	3	5	1	287	27.77
14	12	1	2	0	308	6.56	9	8	4	4	0	287	34.96
11	10	1	9	16	307	34.96	9	8	4	4	0	287	34.96
9	8	1	6	1	305	34.96	10	9	8	11	25	287	34.96
9	8	9	4	8	305	27.77	7	6	4	6	11	287	27.77

¹ Not certified, failed to pick up food for 3 months.
² Unknown.

³ Certified for June, but did not pick up food.
⁴ Not certified, case closed in May.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The highest amount paid in June 1963 was \$564. The next highest amount was \$410. The next highest amount was \$391. In addition, the families were eligible for surplus commodities.

In West Virginia the highest ADC payment can only be \$165.

I wonder what the critics would say if I were to recommend the institution of a \$165 ceiling on welfare payments in the District of Columbia on the theory that what is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Connecticut said that the city of Washington is the Nation's shame, and that it should be the Nation's example.

It was the Nation's example 2 years ago, when 59.7 percent of the cases in the ADC category were ineligible. The Congress, on the recommendation of the Comptroller General, has tried to correct this situation.

The city of Washington will never be an example to this country so long as

there are situations such as exist in the city now, situations in which paramours live in the homes of scores of recipients of ADC payments and enjoy the benefits of the ADC payments which are intended for the children.

All a mother has to do is to discontinue her continuing husband-and-wife relationship with that paramour, and she can qualify. She can tell him to get out and stay out; that she loves her children and wants to be a dutiful and responsible mother to them. If she does so, she can qualify. She can qualify even though she is employable, if she is needed in the home. This is a fact that is not generally known; at least it is not talked about. Employable mothers needed in the home can qualify for public assistance under the present regulations.

No; the critics want us to make the decision.

I say that the mother has the responsibility of making the decision. Let her

tell the paramour to get out. Then the children can qualify if she is needed in the home. It is just that simple.

Reference was made to children who are hungry. There will always be hungry children. There are hungry children in West Virginia, a State which is participating in the program. There are hungry children in the State represented by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], where the program is in effect. There are hungry children in States which do not participate in the program.

Jesus said that the poor will always be with us. There will always be hungry children. The fact that an ADC payment is going into the home of a recipient does not guarantee that the children are not going to be hungry. Many of the children for whom the benefits are intended in the District of Columbia are probably hungry. Why? Because the drink it up and spend the money on mother and the paramour love it up and themselves. The children never see it.

I daresay that there are no more hungry children in the District of Columbia, percentagewise, than there are in cities that participate in this program.

If children are hungry and neglected or mistreated, the Child Welfare Division, through the courts, can remove the children from the homes. The Women's Bureau of the Police Department can also remove such children. The children can be placed in homes of relatives or in foster homes. We have raised the foster home rates. Free school lunches and surplus commodities are provided to keep children from going hungry.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] seeks to have the city of Washington made an example for the country. The Committee on Appropriations is doing its best, under difficult circumstances, to improve the image of the city. It is attempting to use money where it will count most in making this city a good example. That is why we are recommending 44 additional elementary school teachers above the budget estimate.

One way to make this city a good example for the country is to educate its people. This will not be done in a year or a day. But I maintain that if the welfare caseload can be cleaned up and rid of the ineligible, and if the money can be better used for schools, we shall be doing something to make Washington a better example for the country.

The Senator from Connecticut quoted me as saying that the unemployment rate in the district of Columbia is 3.5 percent. I did not say that. According to the Department of Labor, the unemployment rate, at the last reading, was 2.1 percent in the metropolitan area; and the District of Columbia, according to testimony given to our subcommittee, has about two-thirds of the unemployment in the metropolitan area. So presumably the unemployment rate in the District of Columbia is about 3.1 percent. The Department of Labor does not maintain statistics on unemployment in the District of Columbia. These have to be computed on the basis of metropolitan area unemployment and on the basis of the experience derived from the last previous census.

It is said that I have opposed this program because the unemployment rate is so low. What city in the United States has it any better? This is only one of the reasons why I oppose the program. I maintain not only that the unemployment rate is low, but that the general level of prosperity is high. On July 30 of this year, the Washington Evening Star published an article about economic conditions in the District of Columbia. In part, the article stated:

Substantial gains in both Government and private payrolls and evidence of continued population growth were features of a midyear survey of the Washington metropolitan area.

Year-to-year gains dominated all area statistics with few exceptions. Gains for the first 6 months of the year were slightly smaller than for the first 3 months, but this was due mainly to sharp improvement between the first and second quarters last year.

Area payrolls for June were estimated at more than \$395 million, including \$211.8

million from private business and \$155 million from the Federal Government.

The payroll total was the largest for any June on record, with a gain of 5.2 percent from June last year and an impressive 45-percent increase from June 1958, just 5 years ago.

Mr. President, I repeat that the payroll total in the area increased 45 percent from what it was in June, 5 years ago, I continue to read:

Net additions to electric customers, gas meters and telephones during the last year indicated steady growth of population. All of these totals for June 30 were records for that date.

Reflecting expanding needs for homes and offices, a construction boom continued in the 6 months and piled up an area permit total of nearly \$278.5 million. When Federal projects for June are added, the overall total will top \$300 million.

Department store sales and other indicators of retail buying moved comfortably ahead of a year ago to set new records. Sales of autos and appliances also rose, although hotel sales lagged behind as new construction increased capacity and competition.

On the financial front, banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies all reported large gains from a year ago.

EMPLOYMENT

While the Federal Government continues as the largest single employer in the area, total private payrolls exceed the Federal outlay. Actually, private payrolls in the area have grown faster than Federal payrolls in the last 5 years.

Private payrolls of \$211,763,000 in June were up 4.6 percent from a year ago and 54.6 percent from 5 years ago. Private jobs totaling 505,400 in the month were up 2.3 percent from a year ago and 31 percent above 5 years earlier.

Federal Government payrolls of \$155,127,000 for June were 5.8 percent above a year earlier and 33.5 percent ahead of 5 years ago. They covered 267,000 jobs, a gain of 3.8 percent from a year ago and up 16 percent in 5 years.

Total area payrolls of \$395,446,000 were paid to 832,900 employees in June, compared with \$375,886,000 for 809,300 persons in June last year, and \$271,975,000 for 664,600 persons in June 1958.

At another point, the article states:

Area bank deposits and invested capital of savings and loan associations both set new high marks at midyear.

Bank deposits totaled \$2,842,189,893, a gain of 12 percent from a year ago, while savings accounts in the associations expanded to \$1,496,333,881, an increase of 12.6 percent.

Bank loans totaling \$980.6 million were up 11.7 percent and mortgage loans of the savings and loans reached \$1,508,303,161, an increase of 9.8 percent.

These figures indicate that there is a high level of prosperity, not only in the metropolitan area, but also in the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, published in the Washington

Evening Star, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., July 30, 1963]

STAR BUSINESS BAROMETER—AREA PAYROLLS HIT NEW MIDYEAR TOP

(By Donald B. Hadley, Star financial editor)

Substantial gains in both Government and private payrolls and evidence of continued population growth were features of a midyear survey of the Washington metropolitan area.

Year-to-year gains dominated all area statistics with few exceptions. Gains for the first 6 months of the year were slightly smaller than for the first 3 months, but this was due mainly to sharp improvement between the first and second quarters last year.

Area payrolls for June were estimated at more than \$395 million, including \$211.8 million from private business and \$155 million from the Federal Government.

The payroll total was the largest for any June on record, with a gain of 5.2 percent from June last year and an impressive 45 percent increase from June 1958, just 5 years ago.

Net additions to electric customers, gas meters, and telephones during the last year indicated steady growth of population. All of these totals for June 30 were records for that date.

Reflecting expanding needs for homes and offices, a construction boom continued in the 6 months and piled up an area permit total of nearly \$278.5 million. When Federal projects for June are added, the overall total will top \$300 million.

Department store sales and other indicators of retail buying moved comfortably ahead of a year ago to set new records. Sales of autos and appliances also rose, although hotel sales lagged behind as new construction increased capacity and competition.

On the financial front, banks, savings and loan associations, and insurance companies all reported large gains from a year ago.

EMPLOYMENT

While the Federal Government continues as the largest single employer in the area, total private payrolls exceed the Federal outlay. Actually, private payrolls in the area have grown faster than Federal payrolls in the last 5 years.

Private payrolls of \$211,763,000 in June were up 4.6 percent from a year ago and 54.6 percent from 5 years ago. Private jobs totaling 505,400 in the month were up 2.3 percent from a year ago and 31 percent above 5 years earlier.

Federal Government payrolls of \$155,127,000 for June were 5.8 percent above a year earlier and 33.5 percent ahead of 5 years ago. They covered 267,000 jobs, a gain of 3.8 percent from a year ago and up 16 percent in 5 years.

Total area payrolls of \$395,446,000 were paid to 832,900 employees in June, compared with \$375,886,000 for 809,300 persons in June last year, and \$271,975,000 for 664,600 persons in June 1958.

Area estimates for June payrolls and jobs are compared below with a year earlier:

	Period	1963	1962	Percent change
Area employment.....	June.....	832,900	809,300	+2.9
Area payrolls.....	do.....	\$395,446,000	\$375,886,000	+5.2
U.S. Government jobs.....	do.....	267,000	267,000	+3.8
U.S. Government payrolls.....	do.....	\$155,127,000	\$146,661,000	+5.8
Private jobs.....	do.....	505,400	433,000	+2.3
Private payrolls.....	do.....	\$211,763,000	\$202,499,000	+4.6
Local-State government jobs.....	do.....	60,500	58,100	+4.1
Local-State government payrolls.....	do.....	\$28,556,000	\$26,726,000	+6.9
Area unemployment.....	do.....	26,300	24,900	+5.6
District of Columbia jobless payments.....	do.....	\$1,069,544	\$581,266	+84.3

PUBLIC UTILITIES

The Washington area had 545,140 electric customers, 425,147 gas meters, and 1,450,603 telephones on June 30; highest marks for that date on record.

Electric and gas sales in 6 months of 1963

exceeded a year earlier by 8.3 and 9.7 percent, respectively. The June average of originating local telephone calls also set a new high for the month with a jump of 12.5 percent from a year ago. Comparisons with a year earlier follow:

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area electric sales (kilowatt hours).....	6 months.....	3,397,033,387	3,147,540,756	+8.3
Electric customers.....	June 30.....	545,140	529,540	+2.9
Area gas consumption (therms).....	6 months.....	395,047,833	360,283,443	+9.7
Gas meters.....	June 30.....	425,147	413,855	+2.8
Area telephone calls (daily average).....	June.....	6,867,423	6,116,534	+12.5
Area telephones.....	June 30.....	1,450,603	1,359,670	+6.7

CONSTRUCTION

Incomplete construction totals for 6 months of this year indicated an overall area total of more than \$300 million when Federal contracts for June are finally reported.

Private permits in the 6 months aggregated \$278,496,000, with a gain of 8.9 percent

from a year ago. Residential permits of \$179,879,000 were up 7.4 percent and non-residential activity rose to \$60,596,000, up 35 percent. However, new home units lagged slightly.

Six months' permit totals for the area are listed below with figures for a year ago.

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area non-Federal construction.....	6 months.....	\$278,496,000	\$255,769,000	+8.9
Residential permits.....	do.....	179,879,000	167,533,000	+7.4
Nonresidential permits.....	do.....	81,637,000	60,596,000	+35.0
New home units.....	do.....	17,349	17,428	-.5
Area Federal construction.....	5 months.....	16,209,000	13,464,000	+20.3

FINANCIAL INDICATORS

Area bank deposits and invested capital of savings and loan associations both set new high marks at midyear.

Bank deposits totaled \$2,842,189,893, a gain of 12 percent from a year ago, while savings accounts in the associations expanded to \$1,496,333,881, an increase of 12.6 percent.

Bank loans totaling \$980.6 million were up

11.7 percent, and mortgage loans of the savings and loans reached \$1,508,303,161, an increase of 9.8 percent.

Bank debits and clearings were ahead of a year ago by 7.5 and 3.2 percent, respectively. Sales of ordinary life insurance in the District of Columbia rose 9 percent while District postal receipts climbed 18.2 percent.

The latest figures are compared below with those for a year earlier.

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area bank deposits.....	June 29.....	\$2,842,189,893	\$2,537,462,422	+12.0
District of Columbia bank deposits.....	do.....	1,832,089,944	1,693,976,512	+8.1
Suburban deposits.....	do.....	1,010,099,949	843,485,910	+19.8
District of Columbia gross bank loans.....	do.....	980,601,000	877,858,000	+11.7
District of Columbia bank debits.....	6 months.....	15,793,218,000	14,700,916,000	+7.5
District of Columbia bank clearings.....	do.....	4,524,958,955	4,382,859,010	+3.2
District of Columbia savings and loan savings.....	June 30.....	1,496,333,881	1,329,197,205	+12.6
District of Columbia savings and loan loans.....	do.....	1,508,303,161	1,373,201,056	+9.8
District of Columbia life insurance.....	6 months.....	128,392,000	117,000,000	+9.0
District of Columbia postal receipts.....	do.....	22,839,215	19,323,151	+18.2

SALES

Area department store sales increased 8 percent above a year ago in the first 6 months of this year. With downtown Washington stores only contributing a gain of 1 percent, most of the expansion was in suburban branches.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond compiles these figures, but does not give dollar volumes.

Area new-car sales for 5 months of this year were 20.6 percent above a year ago.

Six-month sales in the District alone were up 13.5 percent, while used-car sales rose 2.4 percent. District auto registrations on June 30 were 3.7 percent above a year ago after deduction of transfers.

District collections of sales and gross receipts taxes were 23.2 percent above a year ago in the 6 months. Television unit sales climbed 18.9 percent, while unit sales of radios gained 26.3 percent. Competition caused a 6.2-percent decline in hotel sales.

Six-month totals are given below with those for the same 1962 period:

	Period	1963	1962	Change
				Percent
Area department store sales.....	6 months.....	-----	-----	+8.0
District of Columbia department store sales.....	do.....	-----	-----	+1.0
Television unit sales.....	do.....	37,688	31,691	+18.9
Radio unit sales.....	do.....	40,426	32,021	+26.3
District of Columbia hotel sales.....	do.....	-----	-----	-6.2
District of Columbia sales tax receipts.....	do.....	\$34,807,000	\$28,308,000	+23.2
Area new vehicle titles.....	5 months.....	57,053	47,354	+20.6
District of Columbia auto registrations.....	June 30.....	200,777	193,758	+3.7
District of Columbia new-car titles.....	6 months.....	18,131	15,975	+13.5
District of Columbia used-car sales.....	do.....	30,809	30,103	+2.4
District of Columbia gasoline sales (gallons).....	5 months.....	83,344,447	81,790,767	+1.9

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Study Shows Negroes Get Better Deal in District of Columbia," written by Lee Cohn, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of June 30, 1963. I shall read the first two sentences:

Negroes in Washington are better off—by the yardsticks of income, jobs, and schooling—than Negroes in other big eastern cities, the Labor Department reported yesterday.

Moreover, the report indicated, Negroes here are ahead of whites in some of the other cities in the fields of employment and education.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., June 30, 1963]

STUDY SHOWS NEGROES GET BETTER DEAL IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(By Lee Cohn, Star staff writer)

Negroes in Washington are better off—by the yardsticks of income, jobs, and schooling—than Negroes in other big eastern cities, the Labor Department reported yesterday.

Moreover, the report indicated, Negroes here are ahead of whites in some of the other cities in the fields of employment and education.

But Washington Negroes lag behind whites here in income, jobs, and schooling.

The report is a special analysis of 1960 census data and was prepared by the Department's Bureau of Labor Statistics for President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment and for others interested in welfare, urban planning, employment, education, and market research.

Although the report is based on 1960 census figures, there is no reason to believe the general patterns indicated by the data have changed.

NATIONWIDE STUDY

It is one of 38 reports prepared or in process, analyzing major cities throughout the country on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis. The Washington report draws comparisons with six other eastern cities.

The median family income of Washington's total population in 1959, as reported in 1960, was \$5,993. That was second only to New York's \$6,091, and topped incomes of \$5,782 in Philadelphia, \$5,713 in Buffalo, \$5,659 in Baltimore, \$5,605 in Pittsburgh, and \$5,454 in Newark, N.J.

Washington's nonwhite population, 98 percent of whom were Negroes, had a median family income of \$4,800. That exceeded nonwhites' incomes of \$4,437 in New York, \$4,248 in Philadelphia, \$4,149 in Buffalo, \$4,123 in Baltimore, \$3,833 in Pittsburgh, and \$3,665 in Newark.

The unemployment rate for all Washington males 14 or older, was 4.4 percent in April 1960, and the rate for Washington Negro (nonwhite) males was 5.6 percent.

In the other cities, the total unemployment rates for males were 5 percent in New York, 6.4 percent in Philadelphia, 6.7 percent in Baltimore, 7 percent in Newark, 8.8 percent in Buffalo, and 9 percent in Pittsburgh.

EDUCATION STATISTICS

For nonwhites, the male unemployment rates were 6.9 percent in New York, 9.7 percent in Newark, 10.1 percent in Baltimore, 11.1 percent in Philadelphia, 16.3 percent in Buffalo, and 9 percent in Pittsburgh.

A recession increased unemployment in 1960. Washington was not hit as hard as other cities. The unemployment rate for Negroes in the other cities almost certainly still tops the Negro rate here.

Washingtonians over 25 had completed 11.7 years of school, as a median figure in 1960. The figure for Washington Negroes was 9.8 years.

Median educational attainment was reported at 10.1 years in New York and Pittsburgh, 9.6 years in Philadelphia and Buffalo, 9 years in Newark, and 8.9 years in Baltimore. For nonwhites, the figures were 9.5 years in New York, 9.1 in Pittsburgh, 9 in Philadelphia, 8.8 in Newark, 8.7 in Buffalo, and 8.4 in Baltimore.

Analysts divided Washington into 125 neighborhoods, on the basis of census tracts. As might be expected, neighborhoods with high unemployment rates were characterized by low levels of income and educational attainment. These also were the neighborhoods with high proportions of Negroes and many high school dropouts.

The report said neighborhoods suffering from "social and economic blight" are clustered mostly in the center of the city, roughly between Florida Avenue in the Northwest to the Anacostia River in the Southeast.

NEIGHBORHOODS RATED

Neighborhoods were ranged and grouped into four quarters, or quartiles, according to incomes. In the lowest quartile, with 158,000 residents, median family incomes ranged from \$2,912 to \$4,575 in 1959.

The average unemployment rate for males, 14 or over, was 6.8 percent, 87 percent were nonwhite, 4 percent were of foreign stock, and 10 percent had moved into the Washington area since 1955.

More than half the residents lived in neighborhoods where the median level of educational attainment was only 7.1 to 9.7 years of school, and only 82 percent of those 14 to 17 years old were in high school.

By contrast, the highest quartile had median family incomes of \$7,896 to \$10,000 or more. The male unemployment rate averaged 2.1 percent in the neighborhoods of this group, which had a population of 166,000.

LOW INCOME AREA

Of this population, 11 percent were nonwhite, 28 percent were of foreign stock, and 15 percent had moved into the area since 1955. Nearly three-fourths lived in neighborhoods where the median level of educational attainment was 12.6 to 15.6 years of school. All those 14 to 17 were in high school.

The census tract with the lowest median family income, \$2,912, was the area bounded by South Capitol Street on the east, the Anacostia River on the south, Canal Street SW., on the west, and M Street SW., on the north. Its population was 3,262, of whom 3,218 were Negroes and 42 were white.

The unemployment rate was only 4.5 percent of the 534 persons in the labor force—working or seeking jobs. The median educational attainment for those 25 or older was 8.5 years, and 96 percent of those 14 to 17 were in high school. Five percent of the population had moved into the Washington area since 1955, and 51 percent of them came from the South.

HIGH INCOME AREAS

Sixteen census tracts are listed with median family incomes of \$10,000 or more without specific dollar figures. The one at the top of the list is the Northwest area bounded by Western Avenue, Wisconsin Avenue, Macomb Street, and Massachusetts Avenue.

Its population of 11,698 consisted of 11,554 whites, 49 Negroes, 16 Puerto Ricans, and the balance unspecified. There were 3,120 of foreign stock. The unemployment rate among the 3,206 persons in the labor force was 2.2 percent.

Those 25 or older had a median education of 13.5 years, and all those 14 to 17 were in

high school. Twelve percent of the residents had moved here since 1955, and 29 percent of them came from the South.

The highest unemployment rate for males, 12.6 percent, was reported in two census tracts.

In the Northwest, one of the neighborhoods is bounded by New York Avenue on the north, 5th and 6th Streets on the east, the Mall on the south, and 15th Street on the west.

OTHER FACTS CITED

Its population was 1,489, of whom 896 were whites, 275 Negroes, and the balance of other races. There were 430 of foreign stock. The labor force totaled 676. Median family income was \$4,786.

The other tract, with 12.6 percent unemployment, is in the Southeast, bounded by South Carolina Avenue, Pennsylvania Avenue, 11th Street, and Virginia Avenue. Its population of 5,973 included 1,822 whites and 4,114 Negroes. There were 279 of foreign stock. Median family income was \$4,716. There were 1,420 persons in the labor force.

The lowest listed male unemployment rate, 0.7 percent of the 1,694-member labor force, was in a Northwest neighborhood. This tract is bounded by Massachusetts Avenue, Glover-Archbold Parkway, the Potomac River, Chain Bridge Road, and Nebraska Avenue.

Its population was 6,235, of whom 6,073 were whites, 109 Negroes, and the balance other races. There were 1,575 residents of foreign stock. Median family income was over \$10,000.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of information in regard to unemployment in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia for the years 1960-63.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Unemployment in metropolitan area and District of Columbia, fiscal years 1962, 1961, and 1960

(Thousands)

	Annual report data ¹		Projected ²			Annual report data ¹		Projected ²	
	Metropolitan area unemployment	Percent of metropolitan area labor force unemployed	District unemployment	Percent of District labor force unemployed		Metropolitan area unemployment	Percent of metropolitan area labor force unemployed	District unemployment	Percent of District labor force unemployed
Fiscal year 1962:					Fiscal 1961—Con.				
June.....	24.9	2.7	15.9	3.9	December.....	23.6	2.7	15.1	3.9
May.....	18.1	2.0	11.6	2.9	November.....	22.9	2.6	14.7	3.8
April.....	18.8	2.1	12.0	3.1	October.....	18.9	2.3	12.1	3.4
March.....	24.2	2.7	15.5	3.9	September.....	19.3	2.7	12.4	3.9
February.....	26.4	3.0	16.9	4.4	August.....	21.7	2.2	13.9	3.2
January.....	26.3	3.0	16.8	4.4	July.....	21.7	2.2	13.9	3.2
December.....	21.6	2.4	13.8	3.5	Fiscal year 1960:				
November.....	22.6	2.5	14.5	3.7	June.....	23.9	2.7	15.3	3.9
October.....	19.9	2.3	12.7	3.4	May.....	17.6	2.2	11.3	3.2
September.....	20.9	2.4	13.4	3.5	April.....	17.8	2.2	11.5	3.2
August.....	23.8	2.7	15.2	3.9	March.....	22.8	2.7	14.6	3.9
July.....	24.6	2.8	15.7	4.1	February.....	25.0	2.9	16.0	4.2
Fiscal year 1961:					January.....	23.2	2.6	14.8	3.8
June.....	27.3	3.1	17.5	4.5	December.....	18.0	2.2	11.5	3.2
May.....	20.5	2.5	13.1	3.7	November.....	19.4	2.3	12.4	3.4
April.....	21.0	2.4	13.4	3.5	October.....	17.3	2.0	11.1	2.9
March.....	25.9	3.0	16.6	4.4	September.....	17.2	2.0	11.0	2.9
February.....	31.7	3.7	20.3	5.4	August.....	19.6	2.3	12.5	3.4
January.....	26.1	3.1	16.7	4.5	July.....	20.8	2.4	13.3	3.5

¹ The Labor Market News issued by the U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia. Revisions in the original published data have been incorporated.

² District of Columbia unemployment and labor force data are not normally collected except every 10 years during the U.S. census. Data collected for the District during the census (April 1960) has been used as a benchmark. The assumptions have been

made that the same ratio of labor force for the District to the metropolitan area applied during fiscal year 1961-63 period. In the 1960 census, the District unemployed constituted 64 percent of the unemployed in the metropolitan area. This rate was applied to metropolitan area data to develop District unemployment.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Unemployment in the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area

Month and year	Washington metropolitan unemployment ¹		District of Columbia unemployment ²		Month and year	Washington metropolitan unemployment ¹		District of Columbia unemployment ²	
	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force		Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force	Number unemployed (thousands)	Percent of labor force
1963:					1962:				
June.....	26.3	2.7	16.8	3.9	December.....	21.2	2.2	18.6	3.2
May.....	20.5	2.2	13.4	3.2	November.....	21.5	2.3	13.8	3.4
April.....	19.1	2.0	12.2	2.9	October.....	18.4	2.0	11.8	2.9
March.....	24.5	2.7	15.7	3.9	September.....	19.4	2.1	12.4	3.1
February.....	27.3	2.9	17.5	4.2	August.....	22.3	2.4	14.3	3.5
January.....	26.5	2.9	17.0	4.2	July.....	23.0	2.5	14.7	3.7

¹ Data obtained from U.S. Employment Service for the District of Columbia.² Estimates. District of Columbia unemployment and labor force data are not normally collected except every 10 years during the U.S. census. Data collected for the District during the census (April 1960) has been used as a benchmark. The assumptions have been made that the same ratio of labor force for the District to the

metropolitan area applied during the fiscal years 1961-63 period. In the 1960 census, the District unemployed constituted 64 percent of the unemployed in the metropolitan area. This rate was applied to metropolitan area data to develop District unemployment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that July unemployment in the Washington metropolitan area was 2.4, August was 2.4, September was 2.1, and the Labor Department informed my office this week that the figure was still 2.1 percent of the labor force. The Washington area is rated as a low-unemployment area by the Department of Labor. There is practically no seasonal variation. The impact of students is small.

With such an unprecedented level of prosperity and with unemployment rates considerably below the national average, the District does not appear to need a new and costly welfare program.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has indicated that we should not wear blinders and be oblivious to conditions that exist so close to the Capitol. I submit that Congress has not been stingy in its appropriations for the Department of Welfare in the District of Columbia over the years. I ask consent

to have printed at this point in the Record a table of public assistance grants for the fiscal years 1954 through 1963. The table indicates that Congress appropriated \$2,878,929 for the local share in 1954; and in 1963, Congress appropriated \$5,387,653 in local moneys for grants. Senators will note that when Federal moneys are added, the amounts have not been insignificant.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Public assistance grants, 1954-63

Item	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the disabled	General public assistance
ACTUAL, 1954						
Average number of cases.....	7,546	2,801	2,144	249	1,651	701
Average number of persons.....	14,612	2,913	8,951	264	1,760	734
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$62.50	\$62.50	\$105.26	\$55.78	\$58.96	\$59.71
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$50.95	\$50.95	\$25.21	\$52.55	\$55.63	\$57.02
Total payments.....	\$6,326,316	\$1,781,161	\$2,707,989	\$166,509	\$1,108,342	\$562,315
Federal share.....	\$3,447,387	\$1,040,447	\$1,658,526	\$96,461	\$651,953	
Local share.....	\$2,878,929	\$740,714	\$1,049,463	\$70,048	\$456,389	\$562,315
ACTUAL, 1955						
Average number of cases.....	8,302	3,030	2,335	255	2,136	546
Average number of persons.....	15,991	3,151	9,740	270	2,264	566
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$53.20	\$53.20	\$105.97	\$58.66	\$60.23	\$61.39
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$51.16	\$51.16	\$25.41	\$55.35	\$56.81	\$59.18
Total payments.....	\$7,029,197	\$1,934,786	\$2,909,431	\$179,338	\$1,543,654	\$401,988
Federal share.....	\$3,873,840	\$1,122,585	\$1,803,862	\$100,456	\$846,907	
Local share.....	\$3,155,357	\$812,201	\$1,105,569	\$78,882	\$696,747	\$401,988
ACTUAL, 1956						
Average number of cases.....	8,230	3,069	2,081	255	2,252	573
Average number of persons.....	15,402	3,192	8,957	270	2,387	596
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$53.49	\$53.49	\$108.98	\$60.05	\$61.26	\$62.97
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$51.43	\$51.43	\$25.32	\$56.71	\$57.78	\$60.55
Total payments.....	\$6,964,110	\$1,970,307	\$2,721,878	\$153,746	\$1,655,103	\$433,076
Federal share.....	\$3,787,699	\$1,136,844	\$1,653,717	\$101,101	\$896,037	
Local share.....	\$3,176,411	\$833,463	\$1,068,161	\$52,645	\$759,066	\$433,076
ACTUAL, 1957						
Average number of cases.....	8,542	3,005	2,241	261	2,408	627
Average number of persons.....	16,388	3,125	9,764	277	2,552	670
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$54.39	\$54.39	\$110.23	\$62.55	\$64.25	\$64.56
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$52.30	\$52.30	\$25.29	\$58.75	\$60.63	\$60.39
Total payments.....	\$7,462,742	\$1,961,888	\$2,963,729	\$165,295	\$1,856,745	\$495,585
Federal share.....	\$4,224,417	\$1,177,188	\$1,898,729	\$111,053	\$1,037,447	
Local share.....	\$3,238,325	\$784,700	\$1,065,000	\$54,242	\$819,298	\$495,585
ACTUAL, 1958						
Average number of cases.....	9,532	3,100	2,394	243	2,454	901
Average number of persons.....	19,579	3,224	12,569	258	2,601	987
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$56.13	\$56.13	\$122.83	\$64.06	\$66.74	\$67.71
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$53.96	\$53.96	\$27.83	\$60.34	\$62.97	\$61.79
Total payments.....	\$9,148,720	\$2,087,555	\$4,177,019	\$166,810	\$1,965,415	\$731,921
Federal share.....	\$4,955,682	\$1,250,284	\$2,623,454	\$104,947	\$1,076,997	
Local share.....	\$4,193,038	\$837,271	\$1,553,565	\$61,863	\$888,418	\$731,921
ACTUAL, 1959						
Average number of cases.....	10,680	3,115	3,539	235	2,474	1,317
Average number of persons.....	23,347	3,189	15,900	244	2,560	1,445
Average monthly grant per case.....	\$59.32	\$59.32	\$143.20	\$67.78	\$70.61	\$71.63
Average monthly grant per person.....	\$57.94	\$57.94	\$31.87	\$65.32	\$68.00	\$65.32
Total payments.....	\$11,719,137	\$2,217,170	\$6,081,372	\$191,271	\$2,096,621	\$1,132,703
Federal share.....	\$6,442,495	\$1,439,443	\$3,692,990	\$113,350	\$1,196,712	
Local share.....	\$5,276,642	\$777,727	\$2,388,382	\$77,921	\$899,909	\$1,132,703

Public assistance grants, 1954-63—Continued

Item	Total	Old-age assistance	Aid to dependent children	Aid to the blind	Aid to the disabled	General public assistance
ACTUAL, 1960						
Average number of cases.....	11,458	3,012	4,168	231	2,623	1,424
Average number of persons.....	26,617	3,136	18,878	248	2,781	1,574
Average monthly grant per case.....		\$59.46	\$148.39	\$69.03	\$72.33	\$73.62
Average monthly grant per person.....		\$57.10	\$32.76	\$64.43	\$68.22	\$66.61
Total payments.....	\$13,207,948	\$2,148,921	\$7,422,381	\$191,500	\$2,276,804	\$1,258,342
Federal share.....	\$7,431,630	\$1,465,142	\$4,643,949	\$116,119	\$1,306,420	\$789,214
Local share.....	\$5,866,318	\$683,779	\$2,778,432	\$75,381	\$970,384	\$469,128
ACTUAL, 1961						
Average number of cases.....	12,497	2,954	5,069	216	2,779	1,479
Average number of persons.....	31,105	3,076	23,240	229	2,942	1,618
Average monthly grant per case.....		\$69.49	\$151.07	\$68.29	\$73.19	\$74.47
Average monthly grant per person.....		\$57.13	\$32.95	\$64.58	\$69.13	\$68.05
Total payments.....	\$15,237,496	\$2,108,840	\$9,189,222	\$177,209	\$2,440,755	\$1,321,470
Federal share.....	\$8,525,517	\$1,445,366	\$5,688,479	\$107,690	\$1,888,982	\$989,128
Local share.....	\$6,711,979	\$663,474	\$3,600,743	\$69,519	\$1,056,773	\$332,342
ACTUAL, 1962						
Average number of cases.....	12,706	2,832,839	5,444	202	2,712	1,509
Average number of persons.....	32,864	2,988	25,175	212	2,880	1,639
Average monthly grant per case.....		\$69.15	\$151.22	\$68.39	\$73.16	\$75.66
Average monthly grant per person.....		\$56.78	\$32.70	\$65.24	\$68.90	\$69.55
Total payments.....	\$15,806,329	\$2,015,344	\$9,878,726	\$165,777	\$2,381,219	\$1,368,263
Federal share.....	\$8,971,474	\$1,434,238	\$6,067,815	\$102,034	\$1,370,387	\$789,214
Local share.....	\$6,834,855	\$581,106	\$3,810,911	\$63,743	\$1,010,832	\$579,049
ACTUAL 1963						
Average number of cases.....	11,067	2,650	4,373	190	2,976	878
Average number of persons.....	27,597	2,759	20,543	199	3,151	946
Average monthly grant per case.....		\$61.47	\$152.19	\$71.03	\$74.79	\$74.94
Average monthly grant per person.....		\$59.04	\$32.39	\$67.99	\$70.64	\$68.64
Total payments.....	\$13,562,327	\$1,954,832	\$7,085,217	\$162,162	\$2,670,902	\$789,214
Federal share.....	\$8,174,674	\$1,439,289	\$5,009,276	\$103,691	\$1,622,418	\$789,214
Local share.....	\$5,387,653	\$515,543	\$2,075,941	\$58,471	\$1,048,484	\$0

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, let me proceed a little further on this point, to say that the Department of Welfare of the District of Columbia has fared better than have the other major departments of the District.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the total appropriations for every department of the District of Columbia government for which the appropriation

amounted to \$1 million or more for each of the years 1955 through 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name of agency	Total appropriation	Salary cost of authorized positions	Authorized positions	Name of agency	Total appropriation	Salary cost of authorized positions	Authorized positions
Department of Public Welfare:				Public Library:			
1955.....	\$8,765,100	\$3,468,300	1,035	1955.....	\$1,611,000	\$1,202,400	352
1963.....	\$21,256,700	\$9,880,100	2,366	1963.....	\$3,140,200	\$2,258,600	436
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$12,491,600	\$6,391,800	1,331	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$1,529,200	\$1,056,200	84
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	142.5	184.3	128.6	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	94.9	87.8	23.9
Department of General Administration:				Department of Public Health:			
1955.....	\$2,945,500	\$2,396,300	582	1955.....	\$22,636,000	\$8,997,700	2,759
1963.....	\$6,761,500	\$4,440,600	712	1963.....	\$43,727,800	\$17,864,600	3,689
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$3,816,000	\$2,044,300	113	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$21,091,800	\$8,866,900	930
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	129.5	85.3	22.3	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	93.2	98.5	33.7
National Zoological Park:				Department of Sanitary Engineering:			
1955.....	\$645,000	\$466,900	137	1955.....	\$9,732,700	\$8,789,800	2,781
1963.....	\$147,200	\$1,120,800	210	1963.....	\$17,897,400	\$14,704,200	3,045
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$826,200	\$653,900	73	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$8,164,700	\$5,914,400	264
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	127.9	140.1	53.3	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	83.9	67.3	9.5
Metropolitan Police Department:				Department of Corrections:			
1955.....	\$12,837,500	\$11,635,100	2,473	1955.....	\$4,374,600	\$2,429,200	603
1963.....	\$26,901,900	\$19,509,600	3,132	1963.....	\$7,849,500	\$5,270,900	887
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$14,064,400	\$7,874,500	659	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$3,474,900	\$2,841,700	284
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	109.6	67.7	26.6	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	79.4	117.0	47.1
Education:				Department of Highways and Traffic:			
1955.....	\$27,626,600	\$23,174,400	5,311	1955.....	\$5,768,600	\$3,413,700	939
1963.....	\$57,248,400	\$42,000,100	6,936	1963.....	\$9,624,500	\$7,981,300	1,449
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$29,621,800	\$18,825,700	1,625	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$3,855,900	\$4,567,600	510
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	107.2	81.2	30.6	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	66.8	133.8	54.3
Recreation Department:				Department of Buildings and Grounds:			
1955.....	\$1,641,000	\$808,500	222	1955.....	\$1,675,600	\$946,500	297
1963.....	\$3,348,400	\$1,632,600	283	1963.....	\$2,654,300	\$1,431,500	297
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$1,707,400	\$823,300	61	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$978,700	\$485,000	0
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	104.0	101.9	27.5	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	58.4	51.2	0
Regulatory agencies:				Department of Motor Vehicles:			
1955.....	\$918,200	\$847,800	188	1955.....	\$1,003,000	\$704,900	191
1963.....	\$1,862,000	\$1,548,300	240	1963.....	\$1,588,400	\$1,101,700	219
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$943,800	\$700,500	52	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$585,400	\$396,800	28
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	102.8	82.6	27.7	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	58.4	55.9	14.7
Department of Licenses and Inspection:				National Capital Parks:			
1955.....	\$1,378,000	\$1,249,800	296	1955.....	\$2,344,000	\$1,773,700	522
1963.....	\$2,784,000	\$2,408,600	398	1963.....	\$3,541,200	\$3,262,000	602
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$1,406,000	\$1,158,800	102	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$1,197,200	\$1,488,300	80
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	102.0	92.7	34.5	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	51.1	83.9	15.3
Fire Department:				Washington Aqueduct:			
1955.....	\$6,266,600	\$5,578,400	1,128	1955.....	\$2,127,000	\$1,526,300	369
1963.....	\$12,595,000	\$8,642,400	1,278	1963.....	\$2,863,400	\$1,920,500	336
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$6,328,400	\$3,064,000	150	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$736,400	\$394,200	-33
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	101.0	54.9	13.3	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	48.2	24.7	-8.9
Courts:				Total for District of Columbia:			
1955.....	\$3,163,400	\$1,123,200	234	1955.....	\$129,529,000	\$81,768,500	\$20,704
1963.....	\$6,209,400	\$2,344,900	352	1963.....	\$226,735,400	\$161,654,000	\$27,253
Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$3,046,000	\$1,221,700	118	Actual change, 1955-63.....	\$107,206,400	\$80,885,500	\$6,549
Percentage change, 1955-63.....	96.3	108.8	50.4	Percentage change, 1955-63.....	82.8	85.5	31.6

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this table shows that, in total appropriations, the increase for the Department of Public Welfare amounted to 142.5 percent over this period—which was a greater increase than that shown for any other department of the District of Columbia government receiving appropriations of at least \$1 million a year.

The table also shows that, as regards salary costs of authorized positions, the Department of Welfare led all other District of Columbia departments during the period from 1955 through 1963. The increase in the salary costs of authorized positions for this Department was 184.3 percent; and the chart shows that in regard to the total number of authorized positions, the Department of Public Welfare again led all other District of Columbia government departments with an increase of 128.6 percent, whereas no other major department in the District of Columbia government showed an increase of as much as 100 percent. As I have stated, the table does not include the small departments for which the total annual appropriations amounted to less than \$1 million.

I submit these figures in order to show that Congress has been more liberal in its appropriations for the District of Columbia Department of Welfare than for other departments over the recent years. I do not believe the facts justify creation of another welfare program which will require ever-increasing appropriations in the years ahead.

The Senator from Connecticut and other Senators who have joined him in sponsoring this amendment—and I say this with the utmost respect for them, for I do have great respect for the Senators who are sponsoring the amendment—attempt to make the point that the man-in-the-house rule is encouraging desertions. This point is often expressed, and seemingly it is never refuted. They maintain that the adoption of their amendment would reduce desertions inasmuch as it would result in the abolishment of the man-in-the-house rule in the District of Columbia.

However, I defy the Senator from Connecticut and the other sponsors of the amendment to prove to the Senate that the man-in-the-house rule has resulted in an increase in the number of desertions of families in the District of Columbia.

I hold in my hand the annual reports for certain years for the District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare. They indicate for each year the number of ADC cases opened, and they also indicate the number of cases that have been opened because of the absence of a parent. These reports do not support the contention that the man-in-the-house rule is contributing to an increase in the number of desertions of families. Instead, they bear out precisely the opposite; namely, that since the man-in-the-house rule went into effect, the number of cases opened because of the absence of a parent has, percentage-wise, decreased, rather than increased.

This rule, as we now have it, has been in existence since 1955; but no one ever

said anything about it or shed any tears over it until 2 years ago, when the investigations showed that the regulation was not being enforced, along with many other regulations governing eligibility. So it became at that time a bad rule; that alleged change occurred overnight. And now it is said that it is contributing to the desertions of families by fathers.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a tabulation in regard to the number of ADC case openings in the District of Columbia taken from the annual reports for the years 1953 through 1963, together with the number of case openings based upon the absence of a parent.

In a small minority of cases the absence was due to the death of a parent. In a slightly greater number, the absence was due to the incarceration of a parent. But I am going to give the opposition the benefit of the doubt and include all of those cases in absences.

I should like to read the percentages. In 1950, openings based on the absence of a parent constituted 38 percent of the ADC cases that were open. In 1951—40 percent. In 1952—44 percent. At that time the man-in-the-house rule was not in effect, but the openings based on the absences were going up in those years. In 1953—42 percent. In 1954—43 percent. In 1955—50 percent. In 1956—53 percent. At that time the man-in-the-house rule was in effect. In 1957, the percentage begins to drop; here it was 51 percent. In 1958—47 percent. In 1959—46 percent. In 1960—39 percent. In 1961—34 percent. In 1962—31 percent. In 1963—30 percent.

So case openings, based on the absence of parents, are going down instead of up. It is not possible to make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Nor is it possible to maintain, on the basis of these figures which come from the Department's own annual reports, that the man-in-the-house rule is driving husbands and fathers away from their homes, causing them to desert their children, so that the families may qualify for public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that a table headed "Openings, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia, Office of the Director," may be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Openings, Office of the Director, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia

Year	Total openings, ADC	Total absence factors ¹
1963	1,203	265
1962	1,853	582
1961	2,207	769
1960	2,142	848
1959	2,027	934
1958	1,838	881
1957	1,237	649
1956	1,002	527
1955	962	430
1954	1,095	476
1953	852	361
1952	737	320
1951	938	368
1950	1,048	403

¹ Includes death.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to read into the Record some of the testimony which was given to the House Committee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia in its consideration of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1963. The testimony to which I allude was with regard to an AFDC-UP program for the District of Columbia. Commissioner Duncan said—and I am quoting him out of context:

We have had a very good reason for not having attempted to adopt certain of these programs. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am quick to say it has been money.

With regard to the presence of parameours, Commissioner Duncan said:

I do not believe that any person who genuinely believes in good government would want to see the taxes of a people spent on a person who was in total violation of our laws, living in the home, sharing in the food, the rent, and even in some cases sharing in the funds going into that home.

I do not mean to imply that Commissioner Duncan is not supporting the program. He does support the program. He made the point then and there—18 months ago—that the District of Columbia had a money problem. It still has a money problem, and I do not believe that facts justify the inception of another costly welfare program.

Mr. Shea, in his testimony before Representative NATCHER, said:

There are 15 States now participating in this type of program.

Mr. President, today, 18 months later, there are still 15 States participating in this program.

If it is so good, why have not more States begun to participate in it?

Mr. Shea indicated at that time that the total cost of grants and administration in the first year of the proposed program was estimated at \$1,312,000. It is interesting to note a question which Representative NATCHER asked of Mr. Shea. Representative NATCHER said:

Mr. Shea, this statement you make to the committee to the effect that a firmer estimate may result in different figures, how different could the figures be? Would they be different to the extent that instead of the District's portion being \$1,312,000, that it is possible it would be \$3 million?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, it is possible, sir.

I make the point that there is no well-defined, clear, firm estimate of the costs of the program.

Last year before the House subcommittee Mr. Shea indicated that the program would cost \$1.3 million. Then, in response to the chairman's question as to whether the cost might be as much as \$3 million, Mr. Shea indicated in the affirmative, that it very well might be.

This year the Department was unable to present the committee with firm estimates.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a table showing the estimated cost of the program, as those estimates were presented to the subcommittee on the Saturday morning when we took testimony on this subject.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Total cases	Local cost per case	Federal share per case	Total cost per case	Total local cost	Total Federal cost	Total for financial aid
6-month period.....	490	\$382.09	\$317.86	\$699.95	\$187,224.10	\$160,750.40	\$347,975.50
9-month period.....	820	573.15	476.76	1,049.91	469,983.00	390,940.20	860,923.20
12-month period.....	1,105	764.18	635.73	1,399.91	844,414.00	702,494.00	1,546,908.00

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table of the estimates of costs which

were presented by the Department that Saturday afternoon.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of grants and gratuities—AFDC-UP¹ program

	Total cases	Local cost per case	Federal share per case	Total cost per case	Total local cost	Total Federal cost	Total financial aid
6-month plan.....	490	\$515.22	\$428.04	\$943.26	\$252,458	\$206,740	\$462,198
9-month plan.....	820	772.83	642.06	1,414.89	633,721	526,489	1,160,210
12-month plan.....	1,105	1,030.39	856.08	1,886.47	1,138,581	945,968	2,084,549

¹ Aid to families of dependent children—unemployed parents.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, these tables will show precisely what I meant when I said to one of the representatives of the Department:

The figure you have just given represents only the grants, and this figure is already \$537,641 higher than the estimate you came in with this morning, which represents quite a sizable miscalculation.

There was a miscalculation in the estimates for the program—a miscalculation that was brought out under questioning. That incident indicates that the Department is unprepared to give Congress a firm estimate of the cost of the program. Whereas last year Mr. Shea said the program would cost \$1.3 million the first year, it is said now that the cost would be \$2,577,271 for the first year, which is twice as much as the estimate last year. Yet the estimate this year was based upon the same sample survey conducted by the Department in July of last year and upon which it made its estimate at that time.

So, what are we to believe? Is the total cost to be \$1.3 million the first year, or is it to be \$2.5 million?

I do not propose to go into the program with my eyes shut. Moreover, Mr. President, the cost of such a program would be higher per recipient than that of the present ADC program.

The AFDC-UP program cost is \$49.13 per person, whereas the average cost per person in the ADC category at present is \$32.39.

I say to my friend from Connecticut that under his proposal we would be paying \$17 more per person than we are now paying under the ADC program. And I have not yet been able to understand why.

I make the further point that the implementation of the AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia would increase the caseload 28 percent. After 2 years of sweat, toil, effort, and expense the Welfare Department has been able to decrease the ADC caseload 32 percent,

and now it is proposed to increase the caseload by 28 percent, according to the hearings testimony. I think there is no justification for a new program which will reverse the caseload trend.

I have already indicated that the implementation of the AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia would abolish the man-in-the-house rule. As the Senator from Connecticut stated, contrary to the prevailing opinion in many quarters, a similar rule is in effect in at least 15 States throughout the Union.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter written to Mr. William Galvin, Chief, Investigations and Collections Division, District of Columbia, Department of Public Welfare, by John J. Hurley, Acting Director, Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated August 28, 1953. The letter, which was included in the printed hearings, indicates the States which have certain eligibility provisions in public assistance programs similar to those regulations presently in existence in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., August 28, 1953.

Mr. WILLIAM GALVIN,
Chief, Investigations and Collections Division,
District of Columbia Department
of Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GALVIN: At the meeting of the Advisory Committee on Aid to Families With Dependent Children Eligibility Review on August 8, which you attended as a member, you requested some information about certain eligibility provisions in the State public assistance programs.

Enclosed are some data which were extracted from materials submitted by State public assistance agencies as a part of the nationwide AFDC review.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN J. HURLEY,
Acting Director.

STATE PLAN PROVISIONS REGARDING NONLEGAL MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS IN RELATION TO ELIGIBILITY FOR AFDC¹

All States hold legal, adoptive and natural parents responsible to the extent of their ability for the support of minor children. States differ in the degree of responsibility assigned to stepparents.

The following States have special qualifications on the basis of the caretaker-relative's continuing association with another adult of the opposite sex:

ALABAMA

Death of father: If there is no able-bodied stepfather a child is considered deprived of parental support by reason of the father's death if there is no able-bodied father substitute who lives in the home and maintains a marital relationship with the mother, though unmarried to her and the natural or adoptive mother is unable to meet the child's needs according to agency standards.

Death of mother: If the legal father with whom the child lives is unable to meet child's needs according to agency standards and there is need for a caretaker, unless there is an able-bodied stepmother or other able-bodied mother substitute who lives in the home and maintains a marital relationship with the father, though unmarried to him.

Continued absence from the home: Provided there is no able-bodied stepparent or other parent substitute in the home.

Imprisonment, divorce, separation, desertion: There must also be reasonably clear evidence that mother and father have a completely broken relationship.

Unmarried status of parents: Provided also that any marital relationship between the child's natural or adoptive mother and father is broken. Father who continues to go in and out of home and lives with mother as man and wife is held responsible for support of his children only.

ARIZONA

If an unrelated male is living in the household, assistance will not be granted.

ARKANSAS

Stable nonlegal union: Where mother affords the privilege of a husband to a man and there is a continuing relationship, whether or not he is living continuously in the home, deprivation of parental support will not be established.

CONNECTICUT

In any case where it is found that a (non-related male) boarder is living in the home, the worker has the responsibility to advise the mother that she will be ineligible unless the boarder leaves her home immediately.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A child who has been deprived of parental support by reason of death, incapacity, or continued absence from the home becomes ineligible to receive ADC when his mother maintains a continuing relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the man has a relationship to the child similar to that of a father, whether or not he maintains an address elsewhere and is not continuously in the home, unless the man is incapacitated and unable to support the family for that reason.

GEORGIA

Substitute father: Any man living in the home or cohabiting with the mother is held responsible for support of all children in the home. Georgia Department of Public Welfare construes that paramour(s) are substitute father(s) and in families where prom-

¹ Primary source: Methods used by State Public Assistance Agencies in Determining Eligibility (form FB-332) submitted by individual States, January 1953.

isculity or prostitution exists as a pattern of living, the family must look to substitute father for support. An applicant may apply with illegitimate children and, if otherwise eligible, receive AFDC. If after becoming a recipient, another illegitimate pregnancy occurs, the case shall be closed because of prima facie evidence of substitute father relationship, plus no change in pattern of living. The State DPW recognizes stability of relationship even though no legal marriage exists or can exist. Upon reapplication, the burden of proof is on the woman to establish the fact that pattern of living has changed and no substitute father relationship exists.

KENTUCKY

Child living with either parent and person unrelated by marriage in an established family relationship is considered as deprived of parental support only if incapacity exists. Plan lists 10 factors to be considered in determining the existence of such a relationship.

LOUISIANA

When parent is living in a nonlegal union, child is not considered deprived of parental support unless one parent is incapacitated.

MISSISSIPPI

In determining deprivation of parental support or care, the term "parents" includes not only natural parents but also an own parent and (1) an adoptive parent, (2) a stepparent, (3) a common-law parent, or (4) a man or woman who lives in the home and maintains a relationship with the child's own parent, even though not married to him or her. Child living in the home with two able-bodied parents is not eligible. (Policy revision in process provides for inclusion as eligible a case in which one or both parents are incapacitated providing other conditions of eligibility are met.)

MISSOURI

Children are not considered deprived of parental support when living with one natural parent who is able bodied who is living with an able-bodied adult in a legal or non-legal relationship.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

An unrelated male is not permitted to live with an ADC family, whether in their home or his. An unrelated male, within the meaning of this provision, is a man 18 years of age or older who is not related by blood to the ADC parent or other female payee-relative. "Living with" or "in the home of" means that an unrelated male actually lives as a member of the family in the same household with the ADC family, and the personal relationship is one or is likely to become one in which he assumes the role of a husband to the ADC mother or other female payee-relative without benefit of marriage.

NEW MEXICO

Children are not considered to be deprived of parental support if the mother is living with her husband, or has established a relationship with a man similar to that of husband and wife and the mother, children, and man are living in a family setting, regardless of whether the man (or husband) is the father of the children.

NORTH CAROLINA

Unmarried status of parents: In any case where it is found that the mother with a child or children born out of wedlock is maintaining a relationship which amounts to a common-law relationship with a man to whom she is not married, the county board of public welfare may find that the family is not eligible for AFDC as long as the relationship continues.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Common-law relationship: If man and woman living together are considered as having established a common-law relationship it is necessary to clear all eligibility factors applicable to legal parents before children are considered deprived of parental support. Such relationship may be considered as established if (1) man lives in home; (2) man visits frequently for purpose of living with applicant; or (3) there is a pattern of mother having a series of relationships, resulting in children or not. (Where a child results from a casual attachment and no further contacts are had, it cannot be said that a common-law relationship exists.)

TENNESSEE

Unmarried status of parents: When evidence is available to establish a continuing common-law relationship assistance is not given. When a child is born out of wedlock and the alleged father has not had the birth legitimated, services shall be given to both parents of the child to help them function as responsible adults. If marriage is not planned, legitimation or bastardy proceedings may be taken to establish paternity.

TEXAS

Unmarried status of parents: Illegitimate children are eligible on the point of deprivation unless * * * the mother is maintaining a stable relationship with a man who presumably functions as the father or father-substitute in the home of the children.

Stable relationship: If mother of ADC children is cohabiting with a man, children are not deemed deprived of parental support.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I make the further point in opposition that implementation of the program would necessitate additional positions for the Department of Welfare. One example is that of more personnel in the Intake Review Service. This question was considered during the hearings, and a careful reading of the hearings will confirm the need for more positions in the Intake Review Service if the program goes into effect. There will also be a need for more positions in the Office of Investigations and Collections if the program goes into effect.

I make the point that additional opportunities for cheating would be made available, and another heavy administrative burden would be placed upon the Department if such a course were followed.

I believe it would be well for Senators who have not read the Comptroller General's reports submitted to the Committees on Appropriations last year, on the investigation of selected cases under the ADC and GP programs, to do so. I further submit that those who have already read the reports might well read them again, because it is easy to forget the facts.

The investigation showed that in only 28 percent of the cases would the man-in-the-house rule have played any part whatsoever, and that even in those cases if the investigators had obtained additional facts, there might have appeared additional findings as to ineligibility which, without the man-in-the-house rule, would have rendered the cases ineligible for assistance.

The investigation also showed that in 65 percent of cases involving the man-

in-the-house rule the man was employed. If the man was employed, why should he not support the children? Why should he not provide for the mother and the children? I believe the Department has the right to assume that he can provide for them and is providing for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the report on investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children program, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, by the Comptroller General of the United States, the report having been addressed to the chairmen of the Subcommittees on the District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1962

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, July 1962)

WASHINGTON, D.C.,

July 26, 1962.

To the CHAIRMEN, SUBCOMMITTEES ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES ON APPROPRIATIONS.

Herewith is our report on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program, administered by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, June 1962. We participated in the investigation pursuant to your request of March 6, 1962.

The investigation of 236 ADC cases disclosed that the recipients in 133, or 57 percent, of the cases were ineligible for financial assistance under the eligibility requirements and need standards as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The ineligibility of the recipients in 69 of the cases was directly related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule, although in 32 of the cases other ineligibility findings also existed.

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients in the 236 cases investigated leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verification of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the Public Assistance Division

with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,

Comptroller General of the United States.

REPORT

The General Accounting Office has participated with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, in an investigation of selected cases administered by its Public Assistance Division (PAD) under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program. The purpose of the investigation was to determine the facts having a bearing on the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance under the eligibility factors and need standards, as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and to establish whether, on the basis of the facts, the recipients are eligible for such assistance.

The Department of Public Welfare started its investigation of the ADC cases on November 13, 1961. The General Accounting Office participated in the factfinding phase of the investigation beginning on March 14, 1962, pursuant to a request on March 6, 1962, of the chairmen of the Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations.

Summary of investigation findings and actions taken

The PAD office of research and statistics selected 280 ADC cases—about 5 percent of the caseload—for investigation. Subsequently, it was determined that 42 cases had been closed by the PAD prior to review by the investigative unit established to ascertain the factual information, that the caretaker-mother in one case was not investigated because she was in residence at the residential training center, and that the proper record had not been furnished to the investigative unit in another case. Therefore the investigation actually pertained to only 236 cases. The investigation of these cases resulted in eligibility determinations by the PAD, as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Recipients ineligible for financial assistance.....	141	59.8
Recipients eligible for continued financial assistance.....	95	40.2
Total.....	236	100.0

Upon the PAD's notifying the recipients in the 141 cases of their ineligibility for financial assistance, a number of the recipients gave notice of their intention to appeal the discontinuance of the assistance. By June 25, 1962, the PAD had informed us that the status of the 236 cases was as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:		
Financial payments discontinued.....	127	
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings.....	3	
Appeals pending.....	3	
Total.....	133	56.3

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Financial payments continued:		
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards.....	23	
Adjustments in payments based on existing need.....	20	
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments.....	52	
Total.....	95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:		
Financial payments discontinued.....	7	
Appeals pending.....	1	
Total.....	8	3.4
Grand total.....	236	100.0

Purpose of the aid to dependent children program

The purpose of the aid to dependent children program, as stated in the PAD manual, is "to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes or in the homes of relatives through financial assistance and other social services to the needy dependent children, and to the parents or relatives with whom they are living, to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help parents or relatives to attain the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection." In aid to dependent children cases, the child is the recipient and payment is made to the parent or relative in his behalf.

The District of Columbia Aid to Dependent Children Act defines "dependent child" as a child who has been deprived of parental support or care by reason of death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent. However, the PAD Manual requires that both "need" and "deprivation of parental support or care" exist in each case without regard to whether one condition results from the other.

The PAD manual provides that a needy children to be eligible for financial assistance (1) must be under the age of 16 or, if between the ages of 16 and 18, must be in regular attendance at school or be prevented therefrom by physical or mental disability, (2) must be living with a caretaker—relative—father, mother, or other relative of a specified degree of relationship—in a place of residence maintained by the relative as his own home and in which the relative exercises the primary responsibility for the care of the child, and (3) must meet the District of Columbia residence requirements.

The manual sets forth definitions of what constitutes deprivation of parental support by reason of death of a parent, incapacity of a parent to work, a mother's unavailability to work, and a parent's continued absence from the home.

The PAD manual defines "need" as that part of the subsistence requirements of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children) which cannot be met by available income and other resources. The manual provides that the requirements of an assistance unit shall be based on budget standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The budget standards are stated to have been developed on the basis of the cost, obtained from studies made by the Department of Agriculture, of the subsistence requirements recognized as constituting the essentials of living. These requirements include

basic personal requirements—food, clothing, and housekeeping necessities—and shelter requirements. The budget allowances prescribed for the items constituting the subsistence requirements vary according to the number of persons making up the "assistance unit" and their living and eating arrangements. The budget allowances for shelter requirements are the actual costs incurred but not in excess of prescribed maximum amounts which vary according to the number of persons in the assistance unit.

The manual contains detailed procedures, criteria, and instructions for (1) determining the eligibility of a child for financial assistance under many varying conditions, (2) applying the budget standards in determining the amount of an assistance unit's subsistence requirements under varying situations, and (3) determining the income and resources of any and all members of the assistance unit.

Reason for conducting the investigation

The Department of Public Welfare's investigation of the ADC cases was undertaken pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report on House bill 8072,¹ a bill to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1962. The committee stated, in part:

"Public assistance in the District of Columbia has been continually increasing over the past several years, particularly in the aid to dependent children and general public assistance categories. The committee is concerned over this upsurge in grants and recommends that the Department establish, within available funds, a pilot project composed of at least five investigators to ferret out any so-called freeloaders who may be benefiting under the public assistance program."

Planning and direction of the investigation

The Board of Commissioners, on October 5, 1961, approved the establishment of an investigative committee to plan and direct the investigation. The committee was made up of seven representatives of the District of Columbia government—four from the Department of Public Welfare, two from the Internal Audit Office, and one from the office of the Corporation Counsel—and a representative of the Public Welfare Advisory Council. The committee, in a meeting on November 6, 1961, decided that:

1. The investigation of the public welfare cases would be conducted by an independent investigative unit to be established in an office apart from the Public Assistance Division which has the responsibility for the administration of the various public welfare programs.

2. The investigative unit would be headed by the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division, Department of Public Welfare, who would conduct the investigation under the supervision of the committee and the operational direction of the Deputy Director, Department of Public Welfare.

3. The investigation would be conducted in a manner that would avoid all possible implications that it was not entirely and completely objective both in its approach and in its findings.

The investigative committee adopted procedures for the conduct of the investigation. Generally they provided for:

1. The Office of Research and Statistics to make a scientific selection of ADC cases for investigation.

¹ S. Rept. 993, 87th Cong.

² Subsequently redesignated as the Office of Investigations and Collections.

2. The investigative unit to:

(a) Analyze each case and record on a case schedule the essential information and eligibility factors involved in the case.

(b) Make a field investigation of each case to determine the validity of the information and the eligibility factors.

(c) Submit a comprehensive report on the field investigation to the PAD for determining the eligibility of the recipient on the basis of the reported investigative findings.

3. The PAD to (a) review the field investigative report on each case and determine the eligibility or ineligibility of the recipient on the basis of the facts disclosed in the report and (b) notify the chief of the investigative unit of the determination and the action taken, if any.

4. The chief of the investigative unit to refer each case in which he does not concur in the PAD's determination of eligibility to the chairman of the investigative committee for consideration.

5. The investigative committee to review, summarize, and analyze investigative findings, and to make recommendations for further avenues of investigation, depending on the nature of the findings.

Conduct of the investigation

On November 13, 1961, the DPW established an investigative unit in the Bell School building, Second Street and Virginia Avenue SW.—with a staff of five investigators under the direct supervision of the Chief, Resources and Investigation Division—to undertake the investigation of the ADC cases that had been selected. Five more investigators were added to the staff in the early part of January 1962.

The General Accounting Office, on March 12, 1962, assigned 10 representatives to work with the DPW investigators, pursuant to the request of the chairmen, Senate and House Subcommittees on District of Columbia, in a joint letter dated March 6, 1962, that we participate in the investigation in order to accelerate its completion and to insure its independence.

At March 14, 1962, the investigative unit had completed its investigation of 115 of the 236 ADC cases. Also, the PAD had determined the eligibility status of the recipients for financial assistance in 82 of the 115 cases. Therefore, our direct participation in all phases of the field investigation was limited to 121 of the ADC cases.

The following comments pertain to the conduct of the investigation of the cases in which we participated. However, our review of the reports on the investigation of the cases that had been completed prior to our participation indicates that the same approach had been followed in respect to those cases.

The investigation generally was conducted in accordance with the adopted procedures as previously described. A minimum of four home visits were made in all cases except in those cases where ineligibility findings were disclosed by fewer visits. The initial visit was usually made at night or early Saturday or Sunday morning, at which time all members of the families would most likely be at home and available for interview. The initial home visit was made by two investigative teams, one to conduct the interview and the other to assure that no person left the home to avoid the disclosure of his presence. Each investigative team conducting a home visit comprised a DPW investigator and a GAO representative.

The initial home visit was made for the purpose of (1) verifying the facts related

to the assistance unit (2) determining the identity and relationship to the household of any person present who was not a part of the assistance unit, (3) inspecting the living areas to ascertain whether they indicated that a male other than one included in the assistance unit actually was part of the household, and (4) inspecting the household facilities to ascertain whether they were indicative of unreported resources. Additional home visits and home surveillances were made at night and early Saturday and Sunday mornings to verify all information obtained during the initial home visit and to determine whether any unreported male actually resided in the home or had access thereto.

Collateral inquiries were also made which included (1) the checking of (a) vital statistics records to determine the identity and age of the children of the household and (b) school records to determine children's attendance, and (2) various other checks to determine (a) in the case of a person constituting part of the assistance unit, whether facts had been correctly reported relating to his relationship to the household, resources, and employability or whether he had been involved in any transaction or circumstances inconsistent with the case record information, (b) in the case of any other person residing in the home, his relation to the household and the extent of his contribution to the maintenance of the household, and (c) in the case of a male found in the home, but not a resident thereof, his relationship to the household, his regular place of abode, and his employment status. These latter checks involved contacting employers, utility companies, real estate companies, the Police Department, and the Department of Motor Vehicles, as well as other persons, and organizations.

Investigative findings

A summary of PAD's determinations of eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 cases investigated and the actions taken or pending are presented beginning on page 2 of this report. Comments relating to the cases in which the recipients were considered to be either eligible or ineligible for financial assistance are contained in the following sections.

Recipients eligible for financial assistance

The investigation disclosed information indicating that the recipients in 95, or 40 percent, of the 236 cases investigated were eligible for continued financial assistance (see p. 2) but that an adjustment was necessary in the amount of the assistance payments in 20 cases and that some administrative action was necessary in 52 cases to bring them into conformity with manual requirements (see p. 3).

Recipients ineligible for financial assistance

As shown on page 3, the recipients in 141, or 60 percent, of the ADC cases investigated were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for financial assistance—in 133 cases, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the field investigation and, in 8 cases, on the basis of events that occurred subsequent to the completion of the field investigation.

In the following table the 133 cases are classified according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only one ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.2 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases. In appendix II, a further classification of the cases is presented to show the nature of the additional ineligibility findings that existed in the 61 cases.

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases—			
	Considered to be ineligible	Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings	Number of ineligibility findings
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children.....	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children, in relationship similar to that of husband and wife.....	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource.....	10	7	3	13
Subtotal.....	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons.....	11	9	12	13
Living arrangements not clarified.....	11	4	17	22
Parent employed.....	3	1	2	5
Parent employable.....	29	13	16	49
No eligible child in home.....	4	3	1	5
Refusal to cooperate.....	8	2	16	16
Miscellaneous.....	6	3	3	9
Total.....	133	72	61	209

¹ Includes 2 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."

² Includes 1 case involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."

³ Includes 3 cases involving "man constituting an undeterminable resource."

Man-in-the-house rule

The foregoing table shows that the recipients in 61 of the 133 ADC cases were considered to be ineligible because of the involvement of a man in a situation related to the so-called man-in-the-house rule. We ascertained that in eight additional cases a man was involved but the cases were classified according to other investigative findings deemed to be more significant. Thus, the man-in-the-house rule was a factor in

69, or 51.9 percent, of the 133 cases, or 29.2 percent of the 236 cases investigated. However, in 32 of the 69 cases, other investigative findings were disclosed, any one of which, in our opinion, constituted sufficient reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible. It is important to point out that, in the 37 cases where the sole finding related to the man-in-the-house rule, there is the possibility that other ineligibility factors also may have existed since the cases

were not investigated beyond the point where it was definitely established that they were ineligible because of that rule.

Mother living in a continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children

The investigation disclosed 31 ADC cases where the caretaker-mother was associating with her husband and/or the father of one or more of her children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. The PAD Manual, in section 243.132, states that:

"A parent is considered to be continually absent from the home * * * if he is known to be residing away from the home under conditions which imply a definite dissociation from the normal marital relationship and from the normal exercise of parental custody and control of the children; this dissociation may exist whether or not the absent parent's whereabouts are known and whether or not he is making a financial contribution. Continued absence does not exist solely because the parent rents or has living quarters available at another address or is supporting by court order. If the parents are engaging in a marital relationship and the man has free access to the home, then that man is not to be considered as 'absent from the home.'"

"Only in situations where strong, convincing evidence is submitted that a parent is no longer in the home and has discontinued his relationship, shall the factor of continued absence be established."

The manual, in section 243.134, g, states:

"Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the man continues a relationship with the children similar to that of father and children regardless of whether such man lives in the home."

In each of the 31 cases there was no clear dissociation of relationship between the mother and her husband and/or the father of her children. In eight cases the relationship was between the mother and her husband, and in 23 cases the relationship was between the mother and the father of one or more of her children.

Mother living in home with a man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife

The investigation disclosed 20 ADC cases where the caretaker-mother was living with a man other than her husband or the father of any of her children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife.

The PAD Manual, in section 243, 134, states that:

"Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife and the mother, her children, and such man live in a family setting regardless of whether such man is the father of the children."

The recipients were considered to be ineligible in 9 cases solely on the basis of the finding related to the foregoing regulation and in 11 cases on the basis of that finding and various other investigative findings.

Man constituting an undeterminable resource

The investigation disclosed 10 ADC cases where the recipients were deemed to be ineligible for financial assistance because of the presence in the home of a man or men whose relationship to the mother and/or the children and the extent of their contribu-

tion to the support of the mother and the children could not be determined. A similar situation existed in eight other cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant investigative findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.134h, provides, in respect to the situations disclosed in the 18 cases, that a mother and her children may receive financial assistance even if the mother maintains a conjugal relationship with a man, provided the mother and her children are otherwise eligible and all resources available to the mother and the children are determined or clarified in establishing need.

The investigation disclosed that, in each of these cases, a man or men were present in the home but the nature of their relationship with the mother could not be established. Consequently, in none of these cases could the existence of need be established because the extent of the resources available to the mother and children that resulted from the presence of the man or men in the home could not be determined or clarified.

Other ineligibility findings—Resources undeterminable

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases there was evidence of resources available to the recipients but the extent of such resources could not be determined. The finding of undeterminable resources also was present in 39 additional cases which were classified as ineligible on the basis of more significant findings.

The existence of undisclosed resources was determined by admissions of the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of a specified relationship) or by evidence that the family was living on a scale beyond that possible under the financial assistance being provided. In each case, the caretaker-relative was either unwilling or unable to satisfactorily explain the existing situation. Therefore, it was impossible to definitely establish that a need for financial assistance existed.

Living arrangements not clarified

The investigation disclosed that in 11 ADC cases the relationships between the parents of the children and various other persons living together in the same dwelling could not be determined. The same situation existed in 13 additional cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other investigative findings deemed to be more significant.

The questionable relationships which the parents of the children were unwilling to clarify were with landlords, relatives, and purported visitors. This failure to clarify the living arrangements made it impossible to determine either the extent of the available resources or that need for financial assistance existed.

Parents employed

The investigation disclosed three ADC cases in which the parents of the ADC children were employed full time. In two of these cases other findings were also present, and in two additional cases the parent was found to be employed but the cases were considered ineligible because of the existence of more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 235.100, provides that assistance shall be denied in those cases where a parent is employed full time.

Parents employable

The investigation disclosed 29 ADC cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC parents were employable. Also, in eight additional cases

the parents were employable, although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other more significant findings.

The PAD Manual, in section 243.121, states that it is generally expected that a mother without a husband will work to help support her children if she is not incapacitated and if there are relatives or other reliable persons available to care for her children. It also sets forth criteria for guidance in determining whether a mother is employable.

In 16 of the 29 cases, other investigative findings bearing on eligibility were also present.

No eligible child in home

The investigation disclosed four ADC cases where financial assistance payments were being made although no eligible children were in the homes. In two cases, the only child in the home was over 16 years of age but he did not meet the eligibility requirements for a child over that age because he was not attending school regularly. In one case, the child, in respect to which financial assistance had been granted, had not been living in the home since August 1961. In the remaining case, the only child in the home was not related to the caretaker within the required specified degree of relationship.

Refusal to cooperate

In eight ADC cases the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relatives refused to cooperate with the investigators in their attempt to determine facts substantiating that the children had been deprived of parental support or care, or to determine the extent of any existing need. In six of these cases other ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases there also was a refusal to cooperate although the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of other reasons.

With respect to determining need, the PAD manual, in section 350.000, states:

"The agency, therefore, needs factual and authentic information concerning an applicant's and recipient's income and resources in cash and in kind, in order to evaluate and measure them against the budget standard for the determination of the amount of the person's need.

"(a) The worker must clearly explain to the client why the information is needed, and must help him to understand that he has three choices:

"(1) Having his need determined by providing the required information, or authorizing the worker to obtain it;

"(2) Withdrawing his application; or

"(3) Being denied assistance since his need cannot be determined."

"An applicant or recipient who refuses to supply, obtain, or to authorize the worker to obtain information regarding his income and other resources, thereby makes himself ineligible for assistance because his need cannot be established."

The caretaker-relatives' refusal to cooperate with the investigators generally consisted of a refusal to admit the investigators into the home, a refusal to allow the investigators to inspect the interior of the home in order to determine living arrangements, or a refusal to supply information needed to establish the eligibility of a child or children for financial assistance or the extent of the need.

Miscellaneous

In six ADC cases the recipients were determined to be ineligible for financial assistance for the following reasons:

1. Failure of returned husband to register with the U.S. Employment Service (USES)—two cases.

2. Husband's absence only a separation of convenience.
3. Presence of coin-operated machines in home.
4. Absent husband willing but not permitted to return to home (absence not established).
5. Parent's purported incapacity to work not established.

With respect to reason 1, the PAD manual, in section 243.120, states, in effect, that the provisions set forth in sections 244.00 and 245.00, which relate to the general public assistance program, are applicable to the ADC program. Section 245.310 states that active registration with the USES, as a part of the recipient's effort to find work, is an eligibility requirement. In the two cases where the recipients were deemed ineligible for the reason of failure to register with USES, originally the children had been determined to be eligible on the basis of continued absence of the fathers who were committed to the Occoquan Workhouse. In both cases they had been released and were not employed but had not registered with USES.

With respect to the case under reason 2, the investigation disclosed that although the absent parent had dissociated himself from the normal family relationship the absence was primarily for the purpose of enabling the mother and children to obtain ADC aid. In this connection the PAD manual, section 243.132, states:

"Continued absence is not established when, in the judgment of the agency, a man or woman who have lived together make separate living arrangements for the purpose of establishing eligibility for assistance."

In regard to the case under reason 3, the investigation disclosed the presence in the home of several coin-operated machines constituting business activities. These machines consist of a telephone with a lock on it, two television sets, and a washing machine. In addition, there was evidence that the parent in this case may have been engaged in the illegal distillation of whiskey and in other business activities. The PAD Manual, in sections 352.470 and 352.500, states, in effect, that under such circumstances financial assistance cannot be granted in the absence of a clarification of resources in order to determine whether any need exists.

In the case under reason 4, the investigation disclosed that the absent husband was willing to return to his family but was prevented from doing so by his wife. The PAD Manual, in section 243.1348, provides that:

"If the woman bases her need for assistance on the reason of her unwillingness to live with her husband, or to permit him to live in the home, and he is willing to live with and support his family, they are not considered to be in need."

In the final case, an examination of the case record disclosed evidence that the recipients were ineligible because the father, who had been considered unemployable, had not complied with the regulation requiring periodic medical reports to be furnished in support of his claim of unemployability.

Voluntary withdrawals from program

During the investigation, 13 caretaker-mothers voluntarily signed statements expressing their desire to withdraw from the ADC program. In two cases, the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators by denying them permission to examine or inspect the living arrangements and chose to withdraw from the program instead. In each of the other cases the

withdrawal request was made after the investigation had disclosed findings which adversely affected the eligibility of the recipients.

Effect of discontinuance of financial assistance

As shown on page 3, the PAD discontinued financial assistance payments in 134 cases of the 236 cases investigated. The discontinued monthly payments, aggregating \$20,881, had been made on behalf of 511 children.

We have not attempted to estimate the savings that may accrue to the District as a result of the discontinuance of financial assistance in the 134 cases because of the probability that, in some instances, the caretaker-mother may effect changes in her living arrangements that would result in her children's becoming eligible for assistance and, in other instances, actions may be taken to clarify resources or living arrangements or to otherwise comply with the prescribed eligibility requirements and need standards.

Proposal to liberalize the aid to dependent children program

The Director, Department of Public Welfare, in hearings held on May 24, 1962, before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, presented for consideration a program for aid to dependent children of unemployed parents (see p. 1257 of the hearings) predicated on congressional passage of House bill 10606, an act providing for an extension through June 30, 1967, of Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents. The Director, in response to a question by the chairman of the subcommittee as to what percentage of the ADC cases investigated would have been determined to be ineligible if there had been a change in eligibility requirements, stated:

"Assuming the policy on the man in the home were to be changed and if the District were to extend aid to the unemployed, I don't believe there would be a very large percentage, much beyond 17—maybe it would go to 25 percent. But the statistics that have been reported have indicated that most of the reasons given for the closing of the cases, or finding them ineligible has been related to the man-in-the-home policy."

The investigation was not directed toward ascertaining the employment status of the men involved in the 69 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because of the man-in-the-house rule—in 37 cases solely because of that rule and in 32 cases because of that rule and other ineligibility findings. However, the fact that the men involved in 24 or 65 percent of the 37 cases and in 21 of the 32 cases were employed was disclosed through statements made by the mothers of the ADC children or by the men themselves, either to the investigators or to public utility or other companies when seeking service or credit, and verified by the investigators through interviews with the indicated employers. Therefore, since the ineligibility of the recipients was based solely on the man-in-the-house rule in only 37 cases and since the men involved in 24 of the cases were employed, it would appear that in only 13 of the cases would the recipients have been eligible for financial assistance if the proposed program and the man-in-the-house policy, as outlined on page 1254 of the hearings, had been in effect. Thus, instead of 133 ineligible cases, as shown on page 3 of the report, there would have been only 120, or 50.8 percent of the 236 cases investigated, unless the extent of the men's employment in the 24 cases did not meet the criteria set forth in the proposed program.

Conclusions

The high incidence of ineligibility of the recipients for financial assistance in the 236 ADC cases, as disclosed by the investigation and confirmed by the PAD, leads to the conclusion (1) that the PAD, in its determinations and redeterminations of the recipients' eligibility, either had not completely verified facts represented by the recipients as entitling them to financial assistance or had not maintained sufficiently close contact with the recipients to be aware of changes in their conditions or circumstances affecting their continued entitlement to financial assistance, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship) to inform the PAD of the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) that the ADC cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving.

We believe that a continuing field investigation program should be instituted with the objective of investigating ADC cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's prior verification of representations by the recipients. We believe also that such a continuing field investigation program should be conducted by an investigative unit organizationally placed outside the PAD with a reporting responsibility not only to the PAD, but also to the Director, Department of Public Welfare. We believe further that procedures should be adopted to insure that the investigative findings are given adequate and proper consideration by the PAD in making its eligibility determinations.

APPENDIX

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 6, 1962.

HON. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: This will confirm our verbal request for your Office to furnish the investigative personnel that may be required to accelerate completion of the special public assistance investigation now being made by the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia government. As you know, this investigation was urged by our committees during the last session of Congress with a view to ferreting out any cases of violators on the welfare rolls. Since a sizable number of ineligibles have already been disclosed in the 280 selected cases, it is deemed important that all such cases be subjected to an independent review and report by your Office.

It is requested that your report include such additional pertinent information on the District welfare program as may be determined of interest to the committees.

Copies of communications with Commissioner Tobriner giving further details on the subject matter are enclosed.

With warm personal regards, we remain,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,

Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,

Chairman of Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

Aid to dependent children public assistance cases classified by ineligibility findings as disclosed by the investigation

Ineligibility finding	Total number of cases	Number of cases			Ineligibility findings										
		Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings		Total	Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	Mother living with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship of husband and wife	Man constituting an undeterminable resource	Resources undeterminable for other reasons	Living arrangements not clarified	Parent employed	Parent employable	No eligible child in home	Refusal to cooperate	Other
			Number of cases	Number of additional findings											
Man-in-house rule:															
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	13				5	3	1	3		1		
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	13				6	3	1	3				
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	3				3							
Other ineligibility findings:															
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	2	2			2								
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	7	11			1	6			2		1	1	
Parent employed	3	1	2	2				1							
Parent employable	29	13	16	20			3	12	3				2		
No eligible child in home	4	3	1	1					1						
Refusal to cooperate	8	2	6	8			2	4	2						
Other	6	3	3	3				2	1						
Total	133	72	61	76											
Additional ineligibility findings in cases having more than one finding				76			8	39	13	2	8		5	1	
Basic ineligibility findings in cases having a single finding				133	31	20	10	11	11	3	29	4	8	6	
Total ineligibility findings				209	31	20	18	50	24	5	47	4	13	17	

¹ 2 cases of failure to report to U.S. Employment Service; 1 case of separation of convenience; 1 case of incapacity for employment not established; 1 case of absence from home not established; 1 case of coin-operated machines in home; 1 case of forgery of qualifying documents.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have made reference to the fact that an additional welfare program would provide additional opportunities for cheating. I wish to refer to a few cases which make interesting reading.

A mother of 4 children, who had been receiving ADC assistance payments for over 4 years was determined to have been living during the entire period, since September 1957, with a man whom she had reported to the PAD as being her brother but who actually was her paramour and the father of two of her children. The mother admitted to the investigator that the man was employed and earning \$85 a week. She was receiving \$154 a month in assistance payments at the time the assistance was discontinued.

The case involved a man-in-the-house who was working, while the mother was drawing welfare benefits.

A married 27-year-old mother of six children told investigators that the man found in her home was her brother-in-law. The investigation disclosed that he was actually her husband and the father of her children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, and that he was employed and earning about \$65 a week. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, and at the time they were discontinued they amounted to \$191 a month.

These are cases of men living in the homes. They were employed. The fact of their employment was unknown to the Department of Public Welfare.

If we should initiate the proposed new program, although the men say that they will register with the USES and re-register every 30 days, who will know whether the men, the day after they

register, are not working in common laborers' jobs? A man can turn in a different social security number. He can be employed under a different name than the name by which he registers at USES.

This proposal would merely provide another program in which the same cheating which has been discovered could be resorted to again. The man was employed in the case I have cited, and the woman was receiving payments. Why could he not be employed under a new proposal without its being discovered?

I will cite another case of an employed man in the home.

A 24-year-old mother of four children, fathered by three different men, none of whom were her husband, successfully withheld from social workers the knowledge of the birth of her youngest child on March 11, 1961. The father of this child and of one of the other children was found hiding in the bathroom of the ADC mother's home at 6:10 a.m. on a Sunday morning. He admitted spending the night with the ADC mother. He admitted also that he was employed.

I wish to read what the Comptroller General says:

We believe that some of the facts with respect to these and other cases in this category could have been disclosed with only a reasonable amount of effort on the part of social workers. In some of these cases it appears that the recipients were never eligible for financial assistance and that such a finding would have been apparent if the eligibility standards had been diligently applied at the time the applications were first received.

Mr. President, in a situation in which cheating and misrepresentation and deceit have been as rife as they have been

found to be in the District of Columbia, we should be very careful about instituting a new program for the same element that has been cheating the taxpayer and cheating the deserving recipients in the past. If we start this program, it will never end in the District of Columbia, unless Congress decides to abolish the national program.

I make the further point that it would be virtually impossible to establish a feasible and practicable work program in the District of Columbia. This is a necessary component of the AFDC-UP program. Such a program, it was envisioned at the hearings, would require the assignment of workers to District of Columbia departments.

I asked the witness before the committee to explain the work program. He said that individuals would be assigned to jobs in various District of Columbia departments and "will perform services that regular employees are performing. They will perform them to a degree which will improve those services. They will also have to be supervised and trained by employees."

This is a program in which the proposal is being made to put recipients under the AFDC-UP program into the departments of the District of Columbia government to perform services that are being performed by employees already on the job.

In other words, where one man is mowing the grass, they are going to put two men to mowing the grass. Whereas one man has been waiting on the tables at Junior Village or District of Columbia

Village, they are going to put two men there.

The Commissioners, when they came before the committee, requested 1,501 additional positions for the District of Columbia. We can only assume that they requested all of the positions that they could justify in the light of the available revenues. But this program would bring in additional employees. It amounts to a back-door appropriation approach. The recipients under this program are to be put into the Health Department, the Highway Department, the Welfare Department, and the schools. Doing what? Performing services that other employees are already performing.

Do Senators think this would increase efficiency? Do they believe it would increase the morale in the departments? The supervisors would have to train and supervise these people. They would also have to be supervised and trained by other employees. So there would be the additional administrative problem of checking into these cases, seeing that they are trying to get work, and monitoring their actions to see that they are not actually employed. It would constitute an additional burden on the supervisor merely to keep attendance records on these people.

I daresay that many of these persons will not want to work, and they will show up one day and miss the next day or next week, or they will take sick leave and become hustlers. So it is proposed to set up a program whereby these people will be sharpening pencils, raking leaves, and standing in the way of other people who are already doing the job.

It is said that what is good enough for West Virginia is good enough for the District of Columbia. In West Virginia, the unemployed are put to work along the highways, cutting brush. They are put to work fighting forest fires. They are loaned to municipalities where they are put to work. They are loaned to county courts which put them to work in the counties. The District of Columbia cannot provide the possibilities for a feasible work program that will satisfy the needs of these people and, at the same time, be useful, practicable, and beneficial for the city.

If in 1967 Congress should refuse to extend this program and should abolish it, what would happen? The D.C. Department heads would say, "We have 150, or 175, or 200 employees in our departments. We want now to annualize these positions. Do not take them from us. They have been added to our departments under the AFDC-UP program. We cannot now do without them."

Congress will be implored by many officials to annualize those positions. I say it constitutes a back-door appropriations approach. I maintain that this is a substantial and valid objection to an AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Would it not also be true that, under this program as it went along, there would be a grave danger

of these latter people displacing employees who had been steadily employed and who had had the confidence of the persons who employed them? So in the course of a year or two, we would actually find another bad result, that is, the displacing of those who are now employed, and then we would be in the position of having to provide some kind of help for the latter.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I think they could very well displace some of the persons who are already employed in jobs.

Mr. ALLOTT. Most of these persons are not in any kind of job that would be called a highly trained category. Therefore, presumably, once they were in the departments helping and learning the jobs, in a short time they would be able to do the jobs as well as anybody else. So, in the course of a year or two, they could easily displace employees who had been good employees and who had been reliable, because the District of Columbia could then let the regular employees go and use the people who had come into the departments under this program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That would be entirely possible. If the jobs exist now, why do not persons who would qualify under the program get the jobs? We are going to displace persons, or we are going to waste the taxpayers' money, impair the morale of the departments, and contribute to inefficiency, by putting droves of people into the departments where they will literally stand in the way of regular employees.

I call attention to the fact that under this program, it is proposed to pay as high as \$49.13 per person per month. Therefore, if an individual has 10 children, Senators can figure out for themselves what he will get under the program, whereas the man next door, who is a father and who is trying to find work and who is eligible for unemployment compensation, gets a maximum of \$49 a week in the District of Columbia with which to feed his family regardless of the number of children.

Now, the argument is made that our position fosters illegitimacy. The Senator mentioned illegitimacy a moment ago. I maintain that the record cannot be made much worse than that which already exists. There were 14,896 children on the ADC rolls as in June of this year. Of that number, 6,181 were illegitimate. That is 41.5 percent.

Six mothers have 61 illegitimate children. Does this startle Senators?

Another 10 mothers have 90 illegitimate children—15 other mothers have 120 illegitimate children. There are 36 additional mothers who have 252 illegitimate children. In other words, there are 3 dozen mothers with 21 dozen illegitimate children—7 children for each mother.

Can the picture be made much worse?

I did not make the regulations for the District of Columbia's Welfare Department. I only intend to see that they are enforced, so far as possible, by way of the appropriations method.

Fifty-seven families have been on the rolls for 15 years or more. Two families

have been on the rolls for 21 years or more.

Now it is proposed to open up another program which would enable families to be on the rolls ad infinitum.

The Senator from Connecticut referred to the cost of welfare in the Nation. The appropriations for the welfare programs last year amounted to \$4,859,064,000.

We argued for 3 weeks about a foreign aid program. We cut the authorization to considerably less than the figure I have quoted. I supported some of the cuts. There are those Senators—and I am included among them—who feel it is better to spend money at home than it is to spend it in foreign aid.

Yet welfare is costing \$4.8 billion a year, and is growing. The day will come where the people of the United States will be writing letters from back home telling Members of Congress to revamp the program.

I make the additional objection that the AFDC-UP program, if initiated in the District of Columbia without a work program, would cause recipients to lose whatever incentive they ever had to be self-supporting, and that the program would thus tend to debilitate rather than rehabilitate the recipient. If initiated with a work program—the utter impossibility of providing this type of person with truly productive activity in connection with a District of Columbia work program has already been explored—the recipients would be inclined to be satisfied with the work obtained under this program, and their incentive to find other work would be impaired.

Mr. President, I have no objection to the extension of the unemployment compensation program to cover an additional period of weeks. We are dealing with a situation which should be treated by the unemployment compensation program. I believe that parents who are unemployed and employable, and who have exhausted their compensation payments, possibly should be considered for additional unemployment compensation over an extended number of weeks. I do not believe that this is the type of situation which should be included in public welfare because it will be a never-ending program and it will grow and grow and grow.

I have already stated that the AFDC-UP program would compound the city's already perplexing financial problem. Moneys needed for other worthwhile programs would be siphoned into this program.

Finally, I maintain that the AFDC-UP program in the District of Columbia—and I have already alluded to it—will attract to the city more of the same element which now constitutes a burden upon the taxpayer, and which, in reality, is driving the productive taxpayers out of the city into adjacent areas. This element also contributes to increasing crime costs, increasing health and hospital costs, decreasing property values, and a lower tax potential.

The Senator from New Jersey made reference to the coming of southern Negroes into this city. He may have implied that some of us who oppose the AFDC-UP program might be opposing it

on the basis that it would encourage more of the southern Negroes to come into the city.

I maintain that the element that is coming into the city is not only coming from the South, but from other States as well. There are southern Negroes here, but there are also northern Negroes. I hope the Senator does not mean to imply that those of us who oppose the program are opposing it simply on the basis that it would cause more southern Negroes to come into the city. Unquestionably, such a program would attract more of the same low-income, unskilled people, many of whom are here now. This is not an industrial city and efforts should be made to discourage a further migration of low-income, unschooled, and unskilled people into the Federal Capital. Whether they be white or Negro, of course I want to see them receive assistance if they qualify under the regulations. By the same token, whether they be white or Negro, I want to see them eliminated from the caseload if they are cheating.

The Senator from New Jersey has mentioned southern Negroes. I have been accused of being anti-Negro because I have attempted to clean up the welfare caseload. It is not my fault that that 91.5 percent of the entire welfare caseload is Negro or that 95.4 percent of the ADC caseload is Negro. Why am I trying to aid the schools, if I am anti-Negro? Eighty-five and seven-tenths percent of the school population in the District of Columbia is Negro—an increase of 2.3 percentage points over the previous year. Eighty-seven and six-tenths percent of the school population in the elementary schools is Negro. Seventy-two percent of the teachers last year were Negroes.

If I am so anti-Negro, why am I suggesting that \$46.9 million be appropriated for the Department of Health? Eighty-four percent of the cases at District of Columbia General Hospital last year were Negro—93.6 percent of the venereal disease cases reported were Negro.

It is strange that one can be considered anti-Negro in connection with welfare who recommends the appropriation of money for more teachers than were recommended by the Commissioners, one of whom is a Negro—most of which teachers will be Negroes, probably, and who will teach in schools that are becoming increasingly Negro.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What amount did the Commissioners request? Does the Senator have that figure immediately available?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. We are recommending the appropriation of \$319,582,825, which is \$35,296,025 above the House appropriation, \$23,930,861 more than last year's appropriation, and \$9,141,175 under the budget estimates.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it in excess of the amount the Commissioners requested?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The request was for 344 teachers, and we are recommending 412.

We are allowing 44 more elementary school teachers than were requested, and 25 more teachers for the severely mentally retarded children than were requested.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CASE. With further reference to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio, I had thought—perhaps I was in error—that his inquiry was as to the attitude of the Commissioners toward the man-in-the-house rule and to the appropriation which would be affected by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, in which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I have joined. I think the answer to that point is that the Commissioners favor that amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Ohio did not ask that question. I can say, as I said a little earlier, that Commissioner Duncan is in favor of the amendment. He was in favor of it last year. The Commissioners submitted the request to Congress. I assume they are in favor of the proposal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But by how much does the committee's recommendation exceed the amount allowed by the House? Did the Senator say?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. For welfare?

Mr. LAUSCHE. No; for the entire program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. \$35,296,025.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I wish, in closing, to emphasize that the committee recommended \$29,000, which will be used for the employment of two social workers and for a clerical position. These persons are being added to aid employable mothers in their efforts to obtain jobs. We are also providing grants and gratuities, included in the \$29,000, to enable employable mothers to have an adjustment period of 3 months rather than 1 month. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] has already referred to this.

But the committee feels that if there are employable mothers who are not needed in the home, who have adequate day-care plans, and who cannot obtain jobs, we ought to provide assistance to them in securing employment. This is why we are recommending the additional \$29,000.

I believe the committee has been generous. I have stated my opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut. I shall desist from a further discussion of it at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I support the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in his opposition to the amendment. I concurred with 18 other Senators in the Committee on Appropriations in opposition to the amendment when it was offered there.

I attempted to have the distinguished Senator from West Virginia yield to me

when he first started to speak this afternoon, because I thought he was entirely too modest in his own self-appraisal of what he knows, and what others may know, about this problem. For 2 or 3 years, I had the honor to be a member of the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia is now the chairman. Later, I was transferred from that subcommittee to another subcommittee, but I was a member of the subcommittee during the year and a half when the Senator first began his investigation in an effort to cure the situation which existed in the District of Columbia.

I sat with him, not day after day, but week after week, and sometimes the investigation continued month after month. Other members of the committee did not sit with us. I know that others were critical, perhaps, of the diligence, the patience, and the perseverance shown by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia when he started his investigation, because he had no support. The cry of the bleeding hearts was raised again and again. But gradually the picture was developed, and the General Accounting Office report confirms it in every detail. In fact, in its cold logic, the report makes the picture look even worse than the Senator from West Virginia has described it this afternoon.

As the Senator developed the picture, he gradually drew support to his side. It is not a popular picture. All one has to do is to talk about one child who is hungry, and, of course, people's hearts go out to that hungry child.

I was sorry that the Senator from Connecticut used the illustration he did. I think it was a poor one, and ineptly conceived, because there are women who are unemployable who are not prostitutes. So the case he cited really falls because of the fact that he has used as an illustration a hypothetical woman who is a prostitute and can draw ADC payments. But surely such a case is not illustrative of the general situation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have yielded to the able Senator from Colorado. Will he permit me to make a comment at this point?

Mr. ALLOTT. Certainly.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator from Connecticut gave as an example of women who can get relief under the present regulations a woman who is a prostitute and has three or four children. But that hypothetical situation could not exist if the woman were a prostitute, for she would not receive welfare funds. Instead, the Child Welfare Division would ask—or should ask—the court to remove the children from that home, since the home would be unsuitable. So if such a woman were a prostitute, she could not qualify; and if the fact that she was a prostitute were known to the Child Welfare Division, that Division would have the responsibility of going into court and getting the court to remove the children from that home for placement in Junior Village or in a foster home or in the home of a relative.

But let us consider what could happen. The Senator indicated that in that

hypothetical situation she would be a prostitute and would have had four children by four different men. The same woman could live with one of the four fathers of those children who was unemployed, and all of them could obtain assistance, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I think the Senator from West Virginia is entirely correct, and he states this point better than anyone else could.

Since the Senator began his subcommittee hearings, some 2 or 3 years ago, he has shown that the caseload in the District of Columbia has been reduced by 32 percent. Of course, in view of the small amount which anyone of us individually contributes to the payments which are made in an individual case, we are prone to overlook such payments. But we cannot overlook the fact that such a situation amounts to cheating and fraud and stealing, just as much as if a person endorsed Secretary Dillon's name on a Treasury check.

We are aware that such bad situations exist under the ADC program; and certainly it is to the eternal shame of Congress that in the approximately 20 years, at least, during which these laws have been in existence in this general form, Congress has not provided legislation which would cure this situation.

The Senator from West Virginia has referred to the fact that the caseload was decreased by 32 percent after his investigation, and that if the pending amendment were to be adopted, 28 percent of those persons would immediately go back on the caseload. Of course, the reason for this decrease is that the Senator from West Virginia was able to have enforced for the first time—and the failure to enforce it theretofore is to the disgrace of the administration of the public welfare program in the District of Columbia—the man-in-the-house rule, which, as he has said, has been in effect since 1955.

Does this amendment involve an attempt to gain sympathy? Or, as I maintain, is this a question of having Congress face its responsibility?

If we continue, as we have, with the ADC system, and if we do not correct the laws and regulations, certainly we shall be the ones at fault. But if we were to do away with the man-in-the-house rule—which the Senator from West Virginia has done so much to have enforced—we would then indeed be the most foolish of mortals and the most foolish people in the world to be entrusted with the expenditure of such funds.

Mr. President, I have voted, I believe, two or three times for an extension of the unemployment compensation law. In each instance, when it was requested, I voted for it; and if again I thought it necessary, I would vote for it.

But, Mr. President, when will we begin to face the existing problems and begin to apply the legislative processes to the existing problems, instead of appropriating additional funds "all over the lot" in the hope that the expenditure of additional money and the institution of a new program somehow will help these people?

I shudder to think of the proportion of the money appropriated for aid to dependent children—even though it may have taken away the pangs of hunger from many—that has been spent in booze parlors. The General Accounting Office turned up innumerable examples, as did the Senator's subcommittee.

If it is necessary to extend the unemployment compensation law, let us do so in a straightforward manner. But let us stop trying to dream up fanciful programs which do not apply specifically to the existing problem—merely to be able to say to some people, somewhere, "This is my program."

The Senator from West Virginia has rendered a great service; and I do not believe we shall increase employment or shall put men who are temporarily unemployed into employment by providing ADC payments for children. If the impetus does not exist for the unemployed man to provide for his wife and his children, certainly it will not exist if we further subsidize unemployment, as we have done time and time again.

I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia, and I support him wholeheartedly in his opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, before I proceed in my own time, I wish to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

What would he suggest as an alternative for the employable woman with three legitimate children, to tide her over, beginning with the 91st day?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have already suggested my alternative. I have already made the point that in the District of Columbia there is an unemployment compensation program which will pay up to a maximum of 34 weeks, and that we propose three additional positions in the Department; and the Director has indicated that he thinks three additional positions will be enough to aid these employable women to obtain jobs. I have already made the point that employable mothers who are needed in the home can qualify under the present regulations. They do not have to be needed in the home to take care of their children; they can be needed in the home to take care of an aged person or an ill person—whether the ill person be an adult or a child. To aid employable mothers who have adequate day-care plans and who are not needed in the home, the committee has already provided an alternative.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Under the Unemployment Compensation Act for the District of Columbia, an unemployed kitchen worker receives a maximum of \$130 a month. Assuming that she is a mother with four children, does the Senator from West Virginia believe that mother with four children can live on \$130 a month?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I can remember a time when there was no such thing as public assistance and there was no such thing as unemployment compensation. I grew up in the home of a coal miner prior to and during the depression years when there

was no such legislation as that which provides for these programs; yet, people lived then, although many were out of work then. I say that we cannot provide a program which will meet every possible situation which one can conjure up, unless we intend to usher in the welfare state in full bloom and without further ado; and, Mr. President, I do not intend to go down that road.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Neither do I. But does the Senator from West Virginia advocate that the unemployment compensation laws be eliminated?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have not advocated that.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But the Senator implied that when he said there was a day when there was no unemployment compensation law. However, that day has gone forever, and I do not know of anyone who advocates repeal of the existing unemployment compensation legislation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am not going to let the Senator put words in my mouth. I did not imply that the program should be abolished. I merely said there was a time in this country when there was no such program. We have it now. People were then able to earn bread by the sweat of their brow, and they can do so now.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I still would like to know how we would take care of that unemployed woman with four small children, a grandmother taking care of the children, and the mother who cannot get a job, beginning with the 91st day.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If she qualifies for unemployment compensation, perhaps this is the answer. If she has not been working, so as to qualify for unemployment compensation, perhaps there is a concealed income or unrevealed resources, because I note that she has four small children, according to the hypothetical details you have outlined, and an employed paramour or husband may be in the picture. If she is untrained for employment, perhaps she could enroll at the Public Welfare Training Center—at least the suggestion would be worthy of exploration. The children should not starve. As I have already stated, there are surplus commodities and free school lunches. There are private charitable organizations in the city which may help. Assistance should be given to the mother in locating a job, and this is why the committee is recommending an appropriation of \$29,000 for the creation of a job-finding unit. Perhaps there are relatives with whom the children could be placed at least temporarily.

Mr. RIBICOFF. If there are relatives who can handle the situation. I can well understand why the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Colorado feel uncomfortable about the article concerning Mr. Sonny Cooper. The fact remains that before he died there were no payments from the District of Columbia, but after he died there were payments from the District of Columbia. That is a fact to recognize in the article published in the Daily News.

When we talk about what is good for the State of West Virginia and what is good for the State of Connecticut, I believe it is important that we also ask

what is good for the District of Columbia. We are talking about an annual program of \$2½ million for the District of Columbia. Let me point out—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator indicated that I was uncomfortable because he had referred to the story in the press about Sonny Cooper.

Will the Senator repeat what he said, to the effect that prior to the death of Mr. Cooper there were no payments and subsequent to his death there were payments.

Mr. RIBICOFF. While Sonny Cooper was in the home and alive, under the rules of the District of Columbia Sonny Cooper's family and the children did not receive assistance. Once Sonny Cooper was dead, his family—his widowed wife and 11 children—became eligible.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I quote to the Senator something which I know he would wish to have corrected in the Record. He said, I believe, that when Sonny Cooper was alive his family did not qualify.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Except when he was in jail.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Except when he was in jail.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am pleased to yield further.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have a report which was supplied to me by the Welfare Department of the District of Columbia on November 15. This is a summary of the case of Willie and Virginia Cooper.

The first assistance payment was authorized for October 1, 1959. The mother was pregnant and the father was unemployable due to a sprained ankle. He was not in jail.

Mr. RIBICOFF. When the father is absent or incapacitated, the children are eligible for assistance.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me continue to set the facts straight for the Senator from Connecticut. A series of checks with Mrs. Cooper began with the birth of twins on February 15, 1960. That necessitated Mr. Cooper remaining at home to care for the children. Assistance was terminated in August 1960. At this time the family was receiving \$345 a month. Reapplication was made August 16, 1962, and terminated as Mr. Cooper was employable. Assistance was received from October 1, 1962 through November 30, 1962, when Mr. Cooper was in jail. The family received \$380 at the time of closing.

Reapplication was made on June 24 of this year.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from West Virginia kindly inform me what the payment was? I did not hear it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Three hundred and forty-five dollars a month. Reapplication was made June 24, 1963, and on July 2, emergency assistance was

authorized. The last assistance payment for the month of November 1963 was in the amount of \$353, and the case is still open.

So I say that the Senator is in error when he indicates to the Senate that the mother only qualified for assistance while her husband was in jail, and that, otherwise, prior to his death she could not qualify and only subsequent to his death were they able to qualify.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Once he was incapacitated or in jail he could receive assistance. But out of jail and not incapacitated, he was ineligible.

I appreciate that the Senator from West Virginia has done a masterly job generally with the budget. It is all right to say how generous we have been in the Senate for the District of Columbia, but I do not want the Senate to forget that we are talking about 490 families who are hungry and not receiving aid. I can appreciate what the Senator has said he has done for education. That is wonderful. But I still believe that a hungry child without any food in his stomach is not a pupil who can learn and be a good pupil in school.

Let us look again at what is good for the State of Connecticut, what is good for the State of West Virginia, and what is good for the District of Columbia. I believe I have some interesting figures on this point. Under the program that we are advocating the State of Connecticut spent in the fiscal year 1963, \$4,801,000. The Federal share was 44.4 percent of that. In the year 1963 the State of West Virginia spent \$20,672,000 for these purposes. The Federal share to the State of West Virginia was 74.9 percent. In my figures are correct, about \$15,504,000 was contributed by the Federal Government to the State of West Virginia for this program.

If the Federal Government can pay the State of West Virginia \$15½ million, for a program like this, I do not see why the Federal Government cannot, for a full fiscal year, spend \$2½ million for the District of Columbia.

We are faced with the principle that what is good for the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut is still good for the District of Columbia. It is important for us to realize that. I do not believe that the Senator is advocating repeal of aid to dependent children of the unemployed in the 15 States, including the State of West Virginia and the State of Connecticut.

The Senator has talked about work programs. He talks about what we could do in the State of West Virginia and what we could not do in the city of Washington. The Senator has spoken about work on roads and clearing brush.

The Senator from Colorado and myself were delegates to the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Belgrade, a Communist country. I do not know whether the Senator observed, but I recall returning about midnight from a meeting and a late dinner, and my eyes goggled when I saw that all through Belgrade men were hosing down the streets of Belgrade. The parks in Belgrade were manicured. It was something one could be proud of.

This is the Nation's Capital. Are we proud of the way the city of Washington looks? I am not talking about the manicuring job that is done in front of the Lincoln Memorial. We talk about what to do with people when their jobs are taken away. On a proper work program we could use them to keep the streets and the parks of Washington clean. We can make the city of Washington the most beautiful city in the world, which it should be as the Nation's Capital, an example for the Nation to follow and for all the world to see.

Those of us who visit the other capitals of the world see what they do in those world capitals; yet we allow our capital city to look slovenly and unkempt. We could take these work programs and make these people useful. We would have people to do that type of job.

The Senator talks about how much of the welfare money is going for booze. It is true that some of this money goes for booze. In 1962, when Congress passed the new welfare program, we provided in that program for protective payments; so, therefore, at the present time, if a family on aid has a mother or father who are drinking up the money, the welfare worker has the right to make those payments on a protective basis to a third person, to make sure that the children are being provided for.

We come down to the question of whether we are going to take care of the problems of the District of Columbia. It is not a question of how generous we have been with the District of Columbia. The question comes down to whether we are going to do for the District of Columbia what we make possible for our 50 States.

The question comes down to a sense of fairness. Shall we do for the District of Columbia what the Senator and I wish to do for West Virginia and for Connecticut, and what we make potentially possible for the other States, if they so desire?

We are not making it possible for the District of Columbia to be in exactly the same position as the other States, including the Senator's State and mine, otherwise.

By the amendment, all I ask is that we accord the same sense of justice, sense of fairness, and sense of equality to the District of Columbia as we afford to all the States.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point an article which was published in the Point Pleasant Register of November 14, 1963, which indicates that the State's welfare caseload shows its first decrease in the history of the Welfare Department of West Virginia.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

STATE'S WELFARE CASELOAD SHOWS FIRST DECREASE

CHARLESTON, W. VA.—State Welfare Commissioner W. Bernard Smith said the State's welfare caseload has been cut by 9,576 in the last 2 years—the first time a decrease has been recorded in the department's history.

Smith told the Kanawha Welfare Council that "no administration has ever before

shown a decrease in caseload. In fact the caseload increased by 5,000 cases from 1956 to 1960," he said.

The commissioner said, "without fear of contradiction," West Virginia has a fewer percentage of ineligible on its caseload than at any point in its administration of welfare programs.

Referring to the reports that West Virginia is among States with high ineligibility rates, Smith said, "We have reduced our caseload during the past 2 years without changing any eligibility factors."

Smith also announced a plan that may hike salaries of some county directors, based on the caseload in each county. Each county director presently receives the same salary.

Smith said he has asked the State Civil Service Commission to allow him to set up the new program, noting that obtaining directors for the large counties has been a problem because of the salary.

No pay cuts would be necessitated, he said, if the plan is approved, there would be substantial increases. A director's starting pay is \$410 a month.

Under the new plan, Kanawha County would offer the highest salary, starting at \$540 a month and increasing to \$705.

"This plan is based on the realization we're not able to recruit county directors" for larger counties "at the salary we now pay," Smith said. He noted there were vacancies now in at least three of the State's larger counties, including Kanawha.

Smith also praised a study conducted earlier by his department and the Kanawha County Medical Society which helped pinpoint ineligibility and effects of the "disease of idleness."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Charleston Gazette of November 15, 1963, entitled "Welfare Said Taking Cash Needed To Curb Other Problems."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELFARE SAID TAKING CASH NEEDED TO CURB OTHER PROBLEMS

(By George Lawless)

A "continually increasing drain of our State's financial resources into various welfare programs" is curbing the solution of other major West Virginia problems, House Speaker Julius T. Singleton, Jr., declared here Thursday.

Singleton told the third annual West Virginia Retailers Association conference:

"I make these remarks concerning the welfare program to point up my meaning when I say that these programs are a continually increasing drain on our State revenue and resources and that moneys expended in these programs could be much more advantageously spent in the field of education, the lack of which among our citizens is a large contributing factor, if not the most important one, in the creation of the need of State welfare."

Singleton also castigated special-interest groups and organizations which, without proposing alternative programs or solutions to problems, sit back and criticize the political agencies of government. Notable exceptions to this attitude, he added, are labor organizations and the West Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

"Too many representative groups or associations," he said, "particularly in the business field, seldom if ever have a program or propose solutions to any of the problems facing State government."

Coincidentally, the West Virginia Retailers Association earlier had unanimously adopted a strongly worded policy resolution de-

claring that West Virginia retailers "are entering the political arena on local, county, State, and National levels."

R. G. Guter, chairman of the West Virginia Retailers Association's legislative committee, told the group, representing 250 companies in 23 West Virginia cities:

"The political atmosphere in West Virginia is not conducive to good community living, profitable enterprise, and progressive development of the State's assets."

In adopting the resolution, the West Virginia Retailers Association pledged financial and personnel resources to a political action program involving:

Screening of potential candidates; urging more business leaders to seek public office; political education and registration drives among associations and employees.

Charles Hopkins, executive secretary of the group, emphasized that West Virginia Retailers Association will retain its major role as a service organization to retailers, but pointed to past legislative actions detrimental to the business community passed through default.

"In making this decision" the resolution read, "retailers note past failures in accepting opportunities to participate in political decisions."

"They recognize that laws affecting both the retailer and the consumer have either passed or failed in legislative bodies without a proper expression of this great business segment of the State."

A free-wheeling exception was the Sunday Closing Act passed by the 1963 legislature, and later declared procedurally unconstitutional by the State supreme court. State retailers pushed hard for the legislation, and in so doing realized the power of organized action, Hopkins said.

The group has petitioned Governor Barron to include a Sunday blue law proposal in his call to the 30-day budget session in January. Unless it is, or an overwhelming majority of lawmakers vote to consider it, the legislation cannot be acted on until 1965.

Singleton held the door open slightly for blue law legislation in January with this remark:

"In my opinion, we should consider more items in the budget session. It seems to me a waste of time to bring the legislature here for 30 days and consider only the budget when other things can be considered."

He described these other things as "items of importance and interest and issues that should be resolved."

Singleton congratulated the retailers in noting, "Regardless of the merits of the Sunday Closing Act, you have taken a stand—too many groups have not."

The lanky Morgantown lawyer took a swing as voter apathy and urged the group to scrutinize closely the men it helps to elect to public office.

"Your opinions here might be formed by what these gentlemen have said, who supports them, and their past experiences in life."

He urged the selection of better qualified and intelligent choice of the people who "will be given the job of working for you for a better West Virginia." Noting that the suggestion is basic, he added: "The fact remains that West Virginia citizens do not indicate at election time that they are interested in their State government. Or, for that matter, in their local government."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I trust the Senator from Connecticut will not feel that I have said anything today in a spirit of rancor. I have not.

I recognize that there is a tendency to point to the State of West Virginia merely because I happen to have the good fortune to represent that great

State in the Senate, along with my colleague [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Today the Senate is not appropriating money for the State of West Virginia. We should keep our attention focused on precisely the issue before us. The Congress is asked to appropriate money for the District of Columbia, not for the State of Connecticut, and not for the Mountain State of West Virginia.

We have difficulty in West Virginia in obtaining appropriations for this program. Our legislature has a difficult time finding money for the program.

I am unalterably opposed at this time to the inception of a new program, because I believe it is not needed, and the District of Columbia government, like West Virginia, will have difficulty in finding money for this program when so many other worthwhile programs and departments are in need of additional finances.

There may come a time when I would join with others in saying that the program is needed, but I do not feel the facts justify the program today.

I am ready to vote on the amendment. I trust that Senators will vote it down.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, no rancor was intended on either side. My respect for the Senator from West Virginia, which was always high, is even higher today.

Like other Senators, I have the highest respect for the Senator's knowledge and his depth of interest in this subject matter. Frankly, I consider it an experience I shall value to engage in the debate with the Senator from West Virginia.

What impressed me the most during the debate was the silence in the Senate, and the attention being paid. The Presiding Officer did not have to rap his gavel for attention and order.

I believe we have started the discussion of the problem today. The amendment, which I expect will be defeated, at least gives us an awareness of the other side of the problem.

Irrespective of the result of the vote today, I say with utmost seriousness that I hope during the coming year the Senator from West Virginia and I will give careful thought and consideration to the many problems which beset the people of this District. Much can be done. The problems here are unique.

I know the Senator from West Virginia shares my pride in the Nation's Capital. I know what the Senator's intentions have been and what he has accomplished, as I indicated previously in the debate. The Senator has made many constructive additions. I believe that Washington, D.C., will be a better city to live in after the adoption of the budget proposed, because of the constructive suggestions which have been made by the Senator from West Virginia.

To a great extent the Senator from West Virginia is the most important individual in respect to the future of Washington, D.C., so upon his shoulders really rests a heavy burden.

I know how complicated are the welfare problems, and how impatient we can be about them. The entire Nation is impatient. Along with the impatience and the problems, there are people who are

hungry. I believe the Senator from West Virginia shares with all of us a desire to make sure that there are no people who are hungry in an affluent society such as that of the United States.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his courtesy. Again I say I consider it a great privilege to be able to engage in this debate with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his kind words. I reciprocate by saying that I have enjoyed our discussion of this matter today, and I commend the able Senator for his continuing interest in public welfare.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report on progress made during the past year by the District of Columbia Welfare Department.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST YEAR'S PROGRESS REPORT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WELFARE DEPARTMENT

1. The cleanup of the ADC and GPA caseload has continued to go forward as recommended by the General Accounting Office and by the Congress.

2. The overall caseload has been reduced from what it was when the investigations began in November 1961, by 23 percent.

The overall caseload has been reduced from a total of 12,969 cases in September 1961, to a total of 9,964 in October 1963.

The ADC caseload has been reduced from 5,601 cases in September 1961 to 3,823 cases in October 1963, or a reduction of 32 percent.

The GPA caseload has been reduced from 1,617 cases in September 1961, to 563 cases in October 1963, or a reduction of 65 percent.

3. A reduction in the annual amount of money for grants has been effected. In just 2 years, from fiscal year 1962 to 1964, the amount for total financial aid has dropped from \$16,376,563 in fiscal year 1962 to an estimated \$12,103,999 for fiscal year 1964.

In local moneys, the reduction has been from \$7,396,311 in fiscal year 1962 to \$4,638,935, estimate for fiscal year 1964.

The Federal share has been reduced from \$8,920,252 in fiscal year 1962 to an estimated \$7,465,064 for fiscal year 1964.

4. A random sample of the aid to the permanently and totally disabled caseload has been conducted at this committee's request and the results have shown that 39.3 percent of the caseload is ineligible.

An audit review of the entire caseload has been initiated and is now in progress.

5. The PAD manual has been simplified at the committee's request and brought up to date. This was submitted earlier in the hearings. The manual contains approximately 150 pages and replaces 3 cumbersome manuals which consisted of several hundred pages of materials that were, to a certain extent, obsolete, repetitious, superfluous, and ambiguous.

6. Regulations concerning overpayments have been tightened so as to allow for collections of overpayments which, under the old policies, were forgiven, forgotten, and written off.

7. Collections of overpayments have increased.

8. The position of Controller, which was created on the recommendation of this committee, has been filled.

9. The Office of Investigations and Collections, which performs many duties other than that of investigating welfare cases, has been greatly strengthened by the addition of 63 investigators and 48 clerical and admin-

istrative positions. The recruitment was successfully effectuated over the past year.

10. Twenty-one GS-9 social worker positions were added by this committee last year to the PAD. These additional positions, together with the elimination of ineligible from the caseload, brought about a reduction in the average caseload per social worker.

The average has now been reduced to that of 107 cases per social worker position.

11. Thirteen unit clerks and four dictaphone operator positions were added in PAD by this committee last year for the purpose of relieving social workers of clerical chores.

This has permitted social workers to have some additional time for visiting the homes of recipients.

12. Whereas heretofore, social workers in PAD were limited to GS-5 and GS-7 positions, this committee last year provided for 21 grade reallocations to GS-9 and GS-11 so as to provide incentive to and improve the morale of social workers. Three supervisory positions were reallocated from grade 9 to grade 11 and these reallocations have now been made.

13. Three additional cottages were provided for Junior Village through an appropriation of \$557,000 and these are now ready for occupancy.

14. The Congress added funds last year in the amount of \$224,603 to provide for passing on to the OA, AB, and APTD recipients increased Federal moneys. Recipients in these categories have been benefiting from the increased payments.

15. The Congress provided three GS-10 social workers in the Child Welfare Division last year for the purpose of accelerating the location of foster homes. Partially as a result of this, in recent months, the discharges from homes have almost equaled admissions at Junior Village. Additionally, five GS-5 homefinding workers, a supervisor, and two recruiters, plus supporting clerical personnel were added in the Child Welfare Division, and these positions have been functioning.

16. An appropriation of \$369,000 last year provided an increase in board rates for foster home care from \$53 to \$57 and for institutional care from \$70 to \$85, and these increases have been put into effect.

17. The Congress provided for a management team survey of the Welfare Department and the survey is still underway. The General Accounting Office participated in the survey.

18. The MAA was implemented in the District of Columbia during the past year.

19. A rearrangement of caseloads has been effectuated so as to permit the assignment of social workers by category. This contributes to a higher degree of specialization and efficiency in dealing with cases.

20. Unobligated and unexpended moneys in the amount of \$553,664, or about 2½ percent of the total amount authorized, were returned by the Department to the Treasury at the end of fiscal year 1963.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a special report to the Senate Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, by the Comptroller General of the United States, dated July 1962.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, July 30, 1962.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Herewith is our special report on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children

program administered by the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, June 1962.

This report, which is being submitted pursuant to your request of June 18, 1962, contains certain information in respect to the investigated cases in addition to that contained in the report submitted to you on July 26, 1962.

Because of the nature of the investigation, many of the statements contained in the report are necessarily based on conclusions arrived at after a reasonable evaluation of facts disclosed through observations, interviews, and admissions and through examination of public and business records.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

SPECIAL REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, JUNE 1962

The General Accounting Office submitted a report to the chairman, Subcommittees on District of Columbia, Senate and House Committee on Appropriations, on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children (ADC) program, Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, on July 26, 1962. This report contains certain additional information in respect to the cases investigated, as requested by letter dated June 18, 1962. (See app. IX.)

CASES INVESTIGATED AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The aforementioned report pointed out that of 280 cases selected by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, for investigation, 42 cases had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit established by the DPW and that 2 cases were not investigated. The report showed that for the 236 ADC cases investigated, the PAD had informed us by June 25, 1962, that the status of the cases was as follows:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Action based on investigative findings:		
Financial payments discontinued	127	53.8
Financial payments continued based on appeal findings	3	1.3
Appeal pending	3	1.3
Total	133	56.3
Financial payments continued:		
No infractions of eligibility requirements or need standards	23	9.7
Adjustments in payments based on existing need	20	8.5
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments	52	22.0
Total	95	40.3
Action based on events occurring subsequent to investigation:		
Financial payments discontinued	7	3.0
Appeal pending	1	0.4
Total	8	3.4
Grand total	236	100.0

In appendixes I through VIII of this report the 280 cases selected by the PAD for investigation are listed to show (1) the 42 cases that had been closed prior to review by the investigative unit, (2) the 2 cases not investigated, and (3) the 236 cases that were investigated. Those in the latter group have been classified according to their eligibility

or ineligibility status. Comments pertaining to the cases in each of the foregoing categories are contained in the following sections of this report.

CASES CLOSED PRIOR TO INVESTIGATION

Shown as appendix I are the 42 cases in this category. We reviewed 28 of these cases for the purpose of evaluating the propriety of the actions taken. We believe that the actions were proper in view of the circumstances involved in each case.

CASES NOT INVESTIGATED

Listed as appendix II are the two active cases which were not investigated. In one of these cases the mother of the ADC children was a resident of the DPW's Residential Training Center, and an investigation of the case was deemed to be inexpedient. In the other case, the PAD inadvertently furnished the investigators a case record pertaining to a previous award which had been discontinued, and the fact that the assistance payments had been reinstated did not become known until after the field investigation work had been completed.

RECIPIENTS ELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

No infractions

Listed as appendix III are the 23 cases in which no infractions of PAD Manual requirements were disclosed by the investigation. Of the 23 cases, 10 had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation. However, our review of the investigation reports on these cases indicated no reason for disagreeing with the PAD's conclusions.

The amount of the assistance payments in the 23 cases ranged from \$62 to \$292 a month, the number of children receiving aid ranged from 1 to 7, and the commencing date of the payments ranged from January 1953 to September 1961. The cases in which assistance had been granted more recently involved the greatest number of children and the largest monthly payments.

The monthly assistance payment in one case was reduced \$33 because of the death of a child which occurred during the period of the investigation.

The fact that the investigation disclosed no irregularities in only 23 cases, or in only 9.7 percent of the cases investigated, is most significant and indicates a very serious weakness in the administration of the ADC program.

Adjustment of assistance payments

Listed as appendix IV [not printed in Record] are the 20 cases in which the recipients were considered eligible for continued assistance but circumstances existed which required the monthly assistance payments to be adjusted.

In 15 cases, the monthly payments were reduced by amounts ranging from \$12 to \$72. In four of these cases, the monthly payments for 1, 2, or 3 months were further reduced in varying amounts to compensate for income which had been received in prior months but not reported. In three cases, similar deductions were made although the rate of the regular monthly payment was not changed.

In one case the monthly payment was increased by \$6 because the recipients were required to move to more suitable quarters.

We participated in the field investigation of 5 of the 20 cases. While the investigation of the other 15 cases had been completed prior to our participation in the investigation, our review of 2 of these cases indicated no basis or disagreeing either with the adequacy of the investigation conducted or with the propriety of the actions taken.

ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS NEEDED

Appendix V [not printed in Record] lists the 52 cases in which the recipients were determined to be eligible for continued assistance but which required some administrative action.

In some cases, the administrative action to be taken was dependent on actions required to be taken by the caretaker-relatives (parents or other relatives of specified relationship).

Examples of the types of actions required follow.

1. Refer to Office of Investigations and Collections (OIC) for recovery of overpayments.
2. Require unemployable parent to obtain an overdue medical examination report.
3. Require mother to take certain required action to locate missing husband.
4. Correct records to show change of address and recompute rental needs.
5. Consider the feasibility of referring children to the Child Welfare Division (CWD).
6. Correct records relating to birth dates of children.
7. Revise rental needs because of change in number of persons occupying a dwelling with members of an assistance unit (caretaker-relative and children).

We participated in the investigation of 24 of the 52 cases. Also, we reviewed 3 of the 28 cases which had been investigated prior to our participation in the investigation and found no reason for disagreeing either with the investigative findings or with the actions necessary to comply with normal requirements.

In 1 of the 24 cases which we investigated jointly with the PAD, the recipients appeared to be ineligible on the basis of findings indicating that both the ADC mother and father were employable. The PAD subsequently obtained medical information which indicated that the father was capable of part-time work only and made arrangements for him to receive medical treatment. Also, the PAD directed the mother to register

with the U.S. Employment Service (USES) and to report weekly on her efforts to find employment.

Although the recipients in each of the 52 cases were determined by the PAD to be eligible for continued assistance, the fact that, in some cases, they were required to take certain actions to completely meet the eligibility requirements and that the failure to do so could result in their becoming ineligible for continued financial assistance is a further illustration of a weakness in the PAD's administration of the program.

RECIPIENTS INELIGIBLE FOR CONTINUED ASSISTANCE

The PAD determined that 141 of the 236 cases investigated were ineligible for financial assistance—133 cases on the basis of the investigative findings and 8 cases on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation. Assistance payments were later reinstated in 3 of the 133 cases on the basis of appeal findings. Appeals are pending in 1 of the 133 cases and in 1 of the 8 cases.

The 133 cases are classified in the following table according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipients' eligibility status. Only 1 ineligibility finding was disclosed in each of 72 cases, and an average of 2.1 ineligibility findings was disclosed in 61 cases.

We participated in the investigation of 79 of the 141 cases. We reviewed the investigation reports in the remaining 62 cases to determine the adequacy of the investigation conducted and the propriety of the PAD's determination of ineligibility in each case. Our review disclosed no reason to disagree with the action taken by the PAD except in one case. (See p. 31.)

Ineligibility finding	Number of cases—			Number of ineligibility findings
	Considered to be ineligible	Having a single ineligibility finding	Having additional ineligibility findings	
Man-in-the-house rule:				
Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or father of her ADC children	31	21	10	44
Mother living in home with man other than her husband or father of her ADC children in relationship similar to that of husband and wife	20	9	11	33
Man constituting an undeterminable resource	10	7	3	13
Total	61	37	24	90
Other ineligibility findings:				
Resources undeterminable for other reasons	11	9	2	13
Living arrangements not clarified	11	4	7	22
Parent employed	3	1	2	5
No eligible child in home	29	13	16	49
Refusal to cooperate	4	3	1	5
Miscellaneous	8	2	6	16
	6	3	3	9
Grand total	133	72	61	209

A listing of the cases in each of the foregoing classifications is presented as appendixes VI and VII of this report not printed in the Record. Comments concerning the cases in each of the classifications follow.

MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Mother living in continuing relationship with a man who is her husband and/or the father of her ADC children

As shown in appendix VI the investigation disclosed 31 cases where the ADC mother was associating with her husband and/or the father of her ADC children in a manner which negated the claim that the children were deprived of parental support or care by reason of the continued absence of the parent from the home. No distinction is made as to whether the relationship was carried on inside or outside the home.

In 21 of the cases the "lack of clear disassociation" was the only finding of ineligibility disclosed, but in 10 cases other ineligibility findings existed, any one of which, in our

opinion, was a sufficient reason for considering the recipients to be ineligible.

In 8 of the cases the relationship of the mother was with her husband and in 23 cases the relationship was with a man not her husband although he was the father of one or more of her ADC children. In one of the latter cases the recipient appealed the PAD's determination of ineligibility, and the case remains open pending the outcome of the appeal.

In 18 of the 31 cases the man involved was employed; in 12 cases he was not employed but was apparently employable since there was no evidence of incapacity, either in the form of obvious physical disability or in the form of medical evidence; and in 1 case he was retired and receiving a pension.

Some of the more flagrant cases of abuses of the right to receive assistance under the ADC program are presented below.

1. A mother of four children, who had been receiving ADC assistance payments for

over 4 years was determined to have been living during the entire period, since September 1957, with a man whom she had represented to the PAD as being her brother but who actually was her paramour and the father of two of her children. The mother admitted to the investigator that the man was employed and earning \$85 a week. She was receiving \$154 a month in assistance payments at the time the assistance was discontinued.

2. A 36-year-old mother, who was receiving assistance payments on behalf of herself and four of her six children had received such assistance during most of the period since April 1953. The father of three of the four children, although not their mother's husband, was found by the investigators to be in the mother's home at 6:30 a.m. on a Sunday morning, barefoot and naked to the waist, and hiding under a bed. When asked if he was employed he said that he was a "gambler." The mother had been receiving assistance payments continuously since November 1959, and at the time the payments were discontinued they amounted to \$143 a month.

3. A married 27-year-old mother of six children told investigators that the man found in her home was her brother-in-law. The investigation disclosed that he was actually her husband and the father of her children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, and that he was employed and earning about \$65 a week. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, and at the time they were discontinued they amounted to \$191 a month. She subsequently admitted to the investigators that the man was her husband and stated that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program rather than have the investigation continued.

4. A married 35-year-old mother and her four children had been determined to be eligible for assistance on the basis of her claim that her husband had deserted her and that his whereabouts was unknown. The investigators located the husband and obtained his signed statement asserting that his wife had forced him to leave the home by threats and abuse so that she could obtain public assistance, that his wife had always known his whereabouts, that he had given his wife at least \$50 a month since January 1962, that he is presently employed, and that he wants to return to the home and support his family. The mother had received assistance payments since September 1961, the latest payments being \$169 a month.

5. A 41-year-old mother of six children, all of whom are included in the assistance unit, represented to the PAD that she was living rent free in the attic of her sister's home. She requested the PAD not to probe into the manner in which her sister had obtained her home. She also represented that another woman living in the home, who was a recipient of aid under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD) program, was only a roomer.

The investigation disclosed that the APTD recipient, who was receiving \$83 a month and who had been represented as a widow without relatives, was actually the mother of the ADC mother and was the lessee of the dwelling along with a man who was listed in the lease agreement as her husband. This man, who was found in the home, was determined to be employed full time and earning \$1.25 an hour. The ADC mother, instead of living in this home as she had represented, was found to be living at another address with her children and her husband who was the father of her children. The father had been continuously employed with one firm since 1954 except for one period of 120 days in the early part of 1961 when he was in jail. He had claimed seven dependents on his tax withholding exemp-

tion certificate, which is the same as the number of persons in the assistance unit. The ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since September 1959, with the latest payments amounting to \$149 a month.

6. A 24-year-old mother of four children, fathered by three different men, none of whom were her husband, successfully withheld from the social workers the knowledge of the birth of her youngest child on March 11, 1961. The father of this child and of one of the other children was found hiding in the bathroom of the ADC mother's home at 6:10 a.m. on a Sunday morning. He admitted spending the night with the ADC mother. He admitted also that he was employed. The ADC mother said that this man had been living with her since the birth of her youngest child. The mother had been receiving assistance payments since February 1959, the latest payments amounting to \$109 a month.

We believe that some of the facts with respect to these and other cases in this category could have been disclosed with only a reasonable amount of effort on the part of the social workers. In some of these cases it appears that the recipients were never eligible for financial assistance and that such a finding would have become apparent if the eligibility standards had been diligently applied at the time the applications were first received.

Mother living in home with man who is not her husband or the father of her ADC children in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife

This ineligibility finding was disclosed in 20 cases listed in appendix VI [not printed in Record]. In 11 of the cases, additional ineligibility findings existed.

The men involved in 15 of the cases were employed and in the other 5 cases were unemployed but appeared to be employable. In one of the 15 cases where the men involved was employed, the ADC mother was also employed to the extent that this fact alone would cause the recipients to be ineligible. In three cases, the ADC mother was employable under the prescribed standards for determining employability.

The ADC mothers in 3 of the 20 cases voluntarily withdrew from the program.

Cases illustrating this type of investigative finding follow:

1. A man found in the home of an ADC mother of four children who had received assistance payments since February 1956—the latest payments amounting to \$153 a month—was represented to the investigators as being merely a visitor. The address given by this man as his residence proved to be false, and later both he and the ADC mother admitted that they had been living together but neither would state how long the relationship had existed. The man was employed. The ADC mother admitted that she was also employed, but she would not furnish information as to her employer, length of employment, or earnings. She signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program.

2. A 22-year-old mother, who had received assistance payments since September 1961 for herself and three children admitted during the investigation that she had been supported by a man by whom she was again pregnant. It was determined that this man was employed. The mother signed a voluntary statement requesting withdrawal from the program. When contacted by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, she stated that she had signed the statement because she felt "the jig was up." At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to \$148 a month.

3. A 26-year-old mother of six illegitimate children, fathered by three different men, was again pregnant by a man whom she did not identify. Her condition was known to

the PAD in November 1961. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1960, and as of March 1962 these payments were at the rate of \$79 a month. The April 1962 assistance payment was suspended pending further inquiry into the matters disclosed by the investigation including (a) birth of a child in February 1962, (b) relationship with a man who, she admitted, spent nights with her "too often to mention" and who provided her with money in excess of \$100 a month, (c) presence of another man, his wife, and three children in an apartment in the dwelling, (d) an unidentified sick child in the home, and (e) squalid, overcrowded, and rat-infested premises.

4. A man found in the home of a 27-year-old ADC mother was addressed as "Daddy" by one of the mother's three illegitimate children. The children had been represented to the PAD as having been fathered by two different men, neither of whom was the ADC mother's husband or the man found in the home by the investigators. An informant told the investigators that this man was the ADC mother's current paramour and that a former paramour still frequents the home and creates disturbances. Both of these men are reported to have threatened to kill the other. The man found in the home refused to provide any information concerning his employment status or his relationship to the family. During a visit by a social worker subsequent to the investigation, the ADC mother denied that any serious or intimate relationship existed between her and the man found in the home and said that she would rather be "self-supporting" than to continue to receive public assistance. The monthly assistance payment of \$154 was thereupon discontinued. She had been receiving assistance payments since April 1958.

Man constituting a resource the extent of which is undeterminable

Appendix VI lists 10 cases where the recipients were considered ineligible because a man was involved in the family unit but the extent of his contributions to the support of the assistance unit could not be determined. In each case, the man's relationship with the mother was not determined to be similar to that of husband and wife, nor was his relationship with the children determined to be that of a father. While the investigation disclosed that the man in each of these cases provided some assistance to the family unit, neither the mother nor the man would divulge information as to the extent of the contribution. Therefore, the need for assistance could not be established and the recipients were considered to be ineligible for assistance. In 3 of the 10 cases, additional ineligibility findings were found to exist. The involvement of a man in the family unit was disclosed also in eight other cases which have been classified by other ineligibility findings deemed to be more significant.

The men involved in 12 of the 18 cases were employed, in 4 of the cases the men were unemployed but no evidence was disclosed to indicate that they were not employable, and in 2 of the cases no determinations were made of the men's employment status because of the number of men involved and the undeterminable status of their relationship to the family unit. In one of these latter two cases the recipients appealed PAD's determination of ineligibility and were reinstated for continued assistance after the appeal hearing.

The following examples illustrate the situations found to exist in the cases included in this category.

1. The ADC mother who had three illegitimate children and expected another child in 2 or 3 months, which fact was unknown to the PAD, had been receiving assistance payments since June 1961, the latest payments being \$154 a month. Information provided by the mother concerning the father of her last-born child and that of the ex-

pected child was unverifiable because of her conflicting statements. This ADC mother formerly lived with her mother in a house leased in the name of a man who was not a member of the assistance unit. She moved from that house upon being informed that assistance payments were to be discontinued since her mother could care for her children and she was considered to be employable. Both this man and the ADC mother separately admitted a conjugal relationship over the past 2 years and that the man contributed to the family support. The man is married and living with his wife who stated that she has no respect for him because of his promiscuity and that he is the alleged father of "many" illegitimate children.

2. A 34-year-old mother of seven children fathered by three different men had concealed the birth of the seventh child from the PAD for 3 years through fear of being removed from the ADC program. The father of the seventh child had been living with the ADC mother until the time of the investigators' first visit to the home, although the ADC mother had professed to have terminated the relationship in September 1961 when he got into trouble with the police. The ADC mother stated to the investigators that she realized that she had violated agency regulations. She stated further that the man involved presumably had returned to his wife's home after the investigation of this case had commenced. This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since May 1957 for herself and five of her seven children. These payments amounted to \$221 a month at the time they were discontinued. One of these five children, who was 16 years old, was not in regular school attendance having been absent 29 days between January 29 and April 11, 1962.

3. A 28-year-old mother of five children told the investigators that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program, upon being found with a man in her bedroom. The investigators did not accept her offer of withdrawal since it was made during distress occasioned by being found in an embarrassing situation. The investigators, during the next few days after the first home visit, observed different men entering the home. The mother, during a subsequent visit by the investigators, repeated her request to withdraw from the program. Her request was accepted, and the investigation was terminated. She had been receiving assistance payments since January 1960, and at the time of their discontinuance the payments were at the rate of \$197 a month.

Cases ineligible for other reasons

Resources Undeterminable

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the caretaker-relative either was unable or was unwilling to divulge information relating to income and other resources that apparently were available to the assistance unit. In two of the cases, an additional ineligibility finding was disclosed; namely, the presence of a man in the home whose relationship to the family could not be definitely established but who constituted an available resource. Final determination of eligibility has been withheld in two cases pending the outcome of appeal hearings.

In each of 39 additional cases, the resources available to the assistance unit also could not be determined. These cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings considered to be more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance. Thus, the finding of undeterminable resources was disclosed in 50 cases.

Details of illustrative cases in which this finding was disclosed follow:

1. A 44-year-old ADC mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by men

other than her husband, had been receiving monthly assistance payments since January 1956, the latest payments being \$205 a month. The mother had represented to the PAD and to the investigators that she had no other resources. However, the investigation disclosed that she had earnings of about \$20 a week from caring for children and had received about \$10 a week from a "boy friend" during the period from September 1959 to July 1960 for the purchase of a television set which cost \$419.90. When appraised of these findings, she acknowledged that they were correct. The investigation also disclosed some evidence of other earnings from laundry work, caring for a woman convalescing from a hospitalization, and caring for other children.

2. A 25-year-old ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1959 for herself and two of her three children to augment payments of \$65 a month which she was supposed to receive from her absent husband. The latest of these payments amounted to \$76 a month. Notwithstanding the lack of regular support from her husband, as evidenced by a court order of commitment for back payments, totaling \$466, in September 1961 and by court records showing payments to her of only \$450 during the period from March 1961 through April 1962, she was living in a two-bedroom, well-furnished apartment. The furnishings included a three-speed record player, a cabinet model television set, two telephones, a typewriter, and a radio. Evidence was obtained that she had received contributions from various members of her family which had not been reported to the PAD.

3. A 32-year-old ADC mother of six children, five of whom were included in the assistance unit, telephoned the PAD to state that the investigators had been to her home and that she wished to withdraw from the ADC program. She had previously represented to the PAD that her husband was the father of four of her six children and that the other two children had been fathered by two other men.

The investigation disclosed that she was again pregnant. She told the investigators that a fourth man was the father of the expected child. The investigation also disclosed that she received irregular contributions for the support of the children from two of the three fathers. When pressed for information concerning the amounts of the contributions and the identity of the fourth man, she announced her intention to withdraw from the ADC program. Therefore no further inquiry was made to develop information as to the resources apparently available to her, or as to her employment, evidence of which was also present.

This ADC mother had been receiving assistance payments since December 1960, the latest payments being \$109 a month.

Living arrangements not clarified

Appendix VII to this report lists 11 cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible for financial assistance because the existing living arrangements could not be clarified. In seven of the cases other ineligibility findings also were disclosed. In 13 other cases the living arrangements could not be clarified but the cases have been classified by other ineligibility findings which constituted more significant reasons for considering the recipients to be ineligible for assistance.

The cases included in this category are those where the basic or most significant finding disclosed was the presence in the home of persons whose relationship with the recipients could not be clearly established because of the caretaker-relative's conflicting or misleading statements to the investigators. The term "relationship" as here used includes relationships involving economic

as well as personal and legal aspects. In one of the 11 cases the recipient was reinstated for continued assistance after appeal.

Details of cases illustrating situations constituting this type of ineligibility finding follow:

1. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments for herself and one child since December 1960, was occupying the first floor of a dwelling in which the landlord was also living, without any definite separation of the living quarters and with the personal effects of the ADC mother intermingled with those of the landlord. Although the landlord claimed that his common-law wife lived with him, he would not furnish any corroborating information in support of that claim. He stated that he did not know where she worked or when she could be interviewed in the home. The rental receipts exhibited by the ADC mother appeared to be false since the pertinent information shown thereon differed from statements by the ADC mother and from statements by the landlord. The authenticity of the rental receipts could not be verified since the signatures thereon were purported to be those of the landlord's legal wife who has been absent from the home since December 1960. The lease agreement between the landlord and the rental agency dated December 8, 1961, shows that the landlord claimed the occupants of the dwelling to be himself, his wife, and two children, although he has no children of his own living in the home. The assistance payments to this ADC mother amounted to \$118 a month at the time they were discontinued.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving \$145 a month on behalf of herself and four children had been receiving assistance since July 1953. Living with her in the home were her four adult children with their children, a living arrangement apparently unknown to the PAD. The adult children appeared to be employable and, to some extent, were employed. Efforts to clarify the living arrangements and to determine the extent to which her adult children were contributing to the support of the household were nullified by the conflicting statements of the ADC mother; her refusal to answer some questions; her differing answers to other questions; and, in some instances, her misrepresentation of facts. Also, it appeared that the mother may be employable since all her minor children were in regular attendance at school.

ADC parent employed

Appendix VII lists three cases in which the ADC mother was determined to be employed full time and to have an adequate child care plan.

Illustrative of these cases is one where the mother of three illegitimate children, whose application for financial assistance was approved in August 1961, had been receiving assistance payments of \$119 a month. At the time she applied for assistance, she was considered to be unemployable because she supposedly lacked an adequate child care plan. Although she had indicated on her application that she had been employed, the extent of her employment apparently had not been determined by the social worker. The investigation disclosed that she had been working full time as a domestic for the same employer continuously since 1959, except for 1 month in August 1961, when her youngest child was born. Since her mother, her 18-year-old brother, and her 14-year-old sister lived with her and she had been employed, it was apparent that she was not in lack of an adequate child care plan.

ADC parent employable

Appendix VII lists 29 cases where the ADC mother or, in some cases, the ADC

father, who was supposedly incapacitated, was considered to be employable under the criteria set forth in the PAD Manual. In one of these cases the recipient appealed the ineligibility determination and was reinstated after a hearing on the appeal.

The following cases illustrate the findings leading to the conclusion in these cases.

1. A 45-year-old mother had been receiving assistance payments since August 1961 for the benefit of herself and three children. The investigation disclosed that there was no evidence that the mother was incapacitated and therefore unemployable. Also, she apparently had an adequate child care plan since an unmarried daughter who lived with her was unemployed, was not a member of the assistance unit, and who made no contribution to the maintenance of the household, was available to provide child care. At the time her assistance payments were discontinued she was receiving \$172 a month.

2. A 37-year-old mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments of \$105 a month, although she appeared to be employable under the PAD standards, and had been earning \$12.50 a week in part-time employment. She stated to the investigators that she was doing all right on welfare relief and would not return to full-time employment unless she could make big money. She also had been receiving undeterminable amounts from a boy friend with whom she admitted to have been carrying on a conjugal relationship. The boy friend admitted to helping the family by providing food and personal services and a new hi-fi record player. The investigation further disclosed that on applications for credit he has shown the ADC mother to be his wife. Hospital records show that at various times the ADC mother has stated her address to be that of the boy friend. She had been receiving assistance payments since March 1954.

3. An ADC mother of eight children, four of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since July 1960, although she apparently is employable since she had been employed part time and, for short periods, full time. She informed the investigators that it would be foolish for her to work because she would lose the welfare payment and that it would be too hard for her to work outside the home and also do the work in the home. Her latest assistance payments amounted to \$255 a month.

This ADC mother, before being approved by the PAD as eligible for ADC assistance, had been receiving assistance from the Volunteers of America. This assistance was discontinued when it became known that she was living with a man other than her husband. The investigation disclosed that she has been employed for varying periods as a telephone operator, PBX operator, waitress, and collector. In the latter employment she earned about \$40 a week during December 1961. Her employer stated that if she obtained a driver's license she could be employed full time and become self-supporting. The mother admitted that she had two firm job offers during 1962 which she declined for the reasons stated above.

4. A 26-year-old ADC mother of five children had been receiving assistance payments since March 1960 for herself and three of her children; her other two children are under custody of the Child Welfare Division because of her claim that she is too "weak" to care for five children. She appeared to be physically able to work and admitted that she is. Also, it appeared that the lack of a child care plan should not prevent her from working inasmuch as it had not precluded her from being away from her home for entire nights at which times she either had had her children cared for by a neighbor or had left them unattended. She apparently has

undisclosed resources as evidenced by the fact that she lives beyond the means afforded through her assistance payments. She acknowledged that she had relations with a man but contended that such relations were indulged in outside the home with a certain man whom she identified. The investigators, after three home visits and four other visits when they either were not admitted or could not interview the ADC mother because she was absent, and after a surveillance of the home at seven different times to detect arrivals and departures of persons, on being admitted early on a Sunday morning found a man in the ADC mother's bed. The ADC mother represented the man to be her brother but eventually admitted that he was the man she had previously acknowledged as having had relations with. The man was determined to be an employee of the Department of Public Welfare. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued they amounted to \$132 a month.

5. A 25-year-old mother of four children, two of whom were fathered by two men other than her husband, had been receiving assistance payments since October 1956, the latest being \$181 a month. Upon the investigator's first visit to the home, the mother admitted that she was employable, stated that she did not want investigators coming to her home, and voluntarily signed a statement requesting withdrawal from the ADC assistance program. After she signed the withdrawal statement she said: "Now I can have all the men I want in my home and you men can't do a thing about it."

No eligible child in the home

In appendix VII, four cases are listed where no eligible child was found in the home. Also, in one of the cases it was impossible to clarify the living arrangements. The following cases illustrate the situations in which this finding was disclosed.

1. An ADC mother with one minor child had been receiving assistance pay since December 1948, the latest payments being \$88 a month. However, it was determined that the child was over 16 years of age and was no longer eligible for assistance since she had been officially removed from the rolls of the school she was supposedly attending.

Also living in the ADC mother's home was another daughter and her five children and a man who was the father of the youngest of these children. This daughter had also been receiving ADC assistance payments on behalf of herself and the five children. Although the case was not one of the cases included in the investigation sample, the recipients also were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for assistance on the basis of information disclosed during the investigation.

2. An ADC mother of one child had been receiving assistance payments since September 1953, the latest payments being \$118 a month. Since August 1961, the child has been living and attending school in New York.

Refusal to cooperate

Listed in appendix VII (not printed in the RECORD) are eight cases where the recipients were considered to be ineligible because the ADC mothers refused to cooperate with the investigators in their efforts to determine the facts with respect to the recipients' deprivation of parental support or care or with respect to the need for financial assistance. In six of the eight cases, additional ineligibility findings were present. In five additional cases, a refusal to cooperate was present but the recipients were considered to be ineligible for other reasons deemed to be more significant. Thus, the finding of refusal to cooperate existed in 13 cases.

Illustrative cases are:

1. An ADC mother of three children had been receiving assistance payments since November 1959. During the investigation of her case she submitted a statement in which

she indicated her wish to withdraw from the public assistance program because she did not want investigators coming to her home nor want to answer any questions about her business or household arrangements.

Prior to the time she submitted that statement, the investigators had disclosed certain facts which apparently were unknown to the PAD. These facts are:

(a) The mother of the ADC mother was living in the home.

(b) The ADC mother was paying \$100 a month rent as opposed to \$65 which she formerly had been paying at another address, but was receiving \$50 a month from a tenant.

(c) Numerous articles of men's clothing were found in a hall closet opposite the ADC mother's bedroom.

(d) The ADC mother was working 4 days a week as opposed to the 2 days a week she had represented to PAD.

(e) Her "absent" husband lives directly across the street from her home.

The ADC mother failed to give satisfactory explanations concerning the articles of men's clothing found in her home, or the manner of acquiring two TV sets and two refrigerators also found in the home.

The PAD has determined that overpayments of \$1,400 have been made and has referred the case to the Office of Investigations and Collections for recovery of the overpayments. At the time the assistance payments were discontinued, they amounted to \$108 a month.

2. An ADC mother who had been receiving assistance payments since December 1958 on behalf of herself and two children admitted to investigators that she had been carrying on an affair with a man who she has known for about 20 years and hopes to marry. Despite the frequency of her relationships with this man, which she states occurs about every weekend, she claimed she was unable to provide any information concerning him which would enable investigators to determine the extent of resources available through him. The assistance payments amounted to \$142 a month at the time they were discontinued.

Miscellaneous

Listed in appendix VII (not printed in the RECORD) are six cases which were considered to be ineligible because of findings other than those discussed hereinbefore.

These findings are:

1. A separation of convenience to enable the ADC mother to obtain assistance, rather than a real dissociation of the husband from the family and deprivation of the children of parental support.

2. The presence of coin-operated machines in the home as a source of income, the amount of which could not be ascertained.

3. An employable husband willing to return to the home but not permitted to do so by the ADC mother.

4. The unemployability of ADC mother's husband not established.

5. The failure of a returned husband of an ADC mother to register with the U.S. Employment Service.

Cases closed on the basis of findings disclosed subsequent to the investigation

Attached as appendix VIII (not printed in the RECORD) is a list of eight cases in which the PAD determined that the recipients were ineligible, although the investigation of these cases did not disclose any information indicating ineligibility. However, the records pertaining to seven of these cases show that PAD's determination of ineligibility was based on events occurring subsequent to the investigation and that the determinations were proper under the circumstances involved in each case. The remaining case on this list was determined by PAD to be ineligible on the basis of findings disclosed by the investigation which in our opinion

did not conclusively demonstrate ineligibility. However, we are not in a position to say the action was improper since a judgment factor was involved.

POLICE RECORDS OF ADULTS INVOLVED IN CASES INVESTIGATED

Incident to the investigation of the eligibility of recipients of financial assistance under the ADC program, we requested the Metropolitan Police Department, District of Columbia government, to conduct a name file search of the police records to ascertain the police record, if any, of the adult persons involved in 130 of the cases determined by the PAD to be ineligible. The information on four cases was not requested through inadvertence.

Following is a summary of the results of this record search, classifying the males involved into two categories: one, those men whose names appeared on case records as the husbands of the ADC mothers and the other, those men otherwise identified with the cases:

ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record.....	31
Has no arrest record.....	99
No record check made through inadvertence	4
Total	134
Males:	
Husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record.....	42
Has no arrest record.....	11
Total	53
Other than husbands of ADC mothers:	
Has an arrest record.....	40
Has no arrest record.....	18
Information insufficient to obtain record	7
Total	65
Total	118

The records furnished by the Metropolitan Police Department show that, of the 31 mothers who have police records, 21 had been arrested once, 8 had been arrested twice, 1 had been arrested 3 times, and 1 had been arrested 6 times. The charges included having an unleashed dog, drunkenness, disorderliness, stealing Government checks, and assault with a deadly weapon.

The records showed that 42 of the ADC mothers' husbands had been arrested a total of 358 times. Of the 42 men, 14 had a single arrest, 1 had 2 arrests, 3 had 3 arrests, 2 had 4 arrests, and 22 had 5 or more arrests with 3 of this group each having from 31 to 41 arrests. The records for the 40 other males involved in the cases showed a total of 247 arrests. Of these 40 men, 7 had a single arrest, 4 had 2 arrests, 2 had 3 arrests, 4 had 4 arrests, and 23 had 5 or more arrests with 1 of this group having 29 arrests. The charges in the cases of both groups of men included drunkenness, disorderliness, house-breaking, robbery, grand larceny, assault with a deadly weapon, manslaughter, and homicide.

PLACEMENT OF CHILDREN IN JUNIOR VILLAGE RESULTING FROM CASES CLOSED SUBSEQUENT TO INVESTIGATION

At our request the DPW made a check of the child welfare division (CWD) files to determine the number of children that had been placed in Junior Village because of the discontinuance of financial assistance as a result of the ineligibility determinations.

The Director, DPW, informed us by letter dated June 13, 1962, that, while the CWD had given attention to the children in 28 of the cases investigated, in only 4 of the cases had any children been placed in Junior Vil-

lage as a result of the investigation. He stated that, in the other 24 cases, some children had been committed to the DPW as delinquents and had been placed by the CWD in Junior Village, private institutions, or foster homes but that such actions were not attributable to the investigation. The data submitted with the Director's letter showed that as of June 1, 1962, 16 children were involved in the four cases, that in two of the cases involving 5 children a question exists as to whether the family is actually destitute, and that further investigation by the Office of Investigations and Collections is warranted. Data pertaining to the four cases, as reported to us by the Director, is itemized below:

Case 1 from CWD records

Case opened on May 16, 1962, as the family was destitute. Woman's Bureau placed two of the children in Junior Village on May 15, 1962, and CWD placed the other child in Junior Village on May 16, 1962. All three children remain there.

Case 2 from CWD records

Case opened on May 10, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the Woman's Bureau because the mother was homeless. Two children were placed in Junior Village on May 16, 1962. All three there.

Case 3 from PAD records

Three children were placed in Junior Village on May 1, 1962, as homeless. Referral was made by the Women's Bureau. All these children remain there.

Case 4 from CWD records

Case opened on March 15, 1962, by request of the mother who was referred by the PAD. Six children were placed in Junior Village on March 16, 1962. Two children were placed in Junior Village on March 19, 1962. All eight children remain there.

In case 1 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the ADC mother was found to have been employed for the past 3 years. She was initially determined as qualified for assistance for the reason that she lacked a child care plan, notwithstanding the fact that she had worked for the same employer since 1959. Apparently this employment record was concealed from the social worker, as was the whereabouts of the father of her two youngest children.

In case 2 above the ADC mother was considered to be ineligible because she was continuing a relationship with the father of her children. It was determined that he was unemployed. Although she had received a surplus food certificate, she had not picked up any surplus food since December 1961.

In case 3 above the ADC mother was determined to be living with a man in relationship similar to that of husband and wife. The man was unemployed and evidence was that he did not contribute to the household upkeep. The mother was 3 months in arrears in her rent and said she had no intention of paying it, although she first displayed what proved to be spurious rent receipts. The children were placed in Junior Village after the mother had been arrested for fighting in the street. They had been found unattended in the home on two different occasions by investigators.

In case 4 above the recipients were considered ineligible because the absence of the father of five of the children was one of convenience and not a clear dissociation from the family. This man is being sought by the police as a suspect in a holdup, having been identified by the victim. This fact may account for his absence since he was determined to have been in the home a few days before the initial visit by investigators.

EVIDENCE OF BAD FAITH ON PART OF ADC MOTHERS

The investigation definitely disclosed that reliance cannot be placed on the ADC moth-

ers to reveal the actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on the recipients' eligibility for financial assistance. A specific review was made of 85 of the cases closed by the PAD subsequent to the investigation to determine the number of instances in those cases where the mothers had misrepresented facts or attempted to conceal existing conditions or situations. The review disclosed (1) 11 cases where a man was found hiding in the ADC mother's house—in the bedroom, sometimes under the bed; in a closet; or in the bathroom—or attempting to flee by the back door to evade questioning by investigators and (2) 8 cases of gross misrepresentation of information vital to determining the recipients' eligibility. Illustrative of the type of misrepresentation in these cases are: four cases where the ADC mother falsely identified the man found in the house as a relative or gave information concerning the man which further investigation proved to be false, and four cases where the ADC mother supplied rent receipts or other documents which proved to contain false information. In several of the latter cases there appeared to be collusion on the part of others to assist the ADC mother in her attempts to misrepresent her actual living conditions or circumstances.

We believe that the foregoing instances evidence that ADC mothers are obtaining and attempting to continue to obtain financial assistance for recipients when they are aware that disclosure of actual living conditions or circumstances to the PAD would reveal that they are not entitled to receive further financial assistance.

USE BY PAD OF CODE REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES

We have reviewed the "code reasons for closing cases" which have been assigned by the PAD to the 127 cases closed as of June 25, 1962, on the basis of ineligibility findings disclosed by the investigation. In our opinion the stated code reasons do not always reflect the actual reasons for terminating assistance and distort any statistical data which is based thereon.

Section 624.500 of the PAD Manual provides that the "classification of reasons for closing cases should reflect events that lead to ineligibility with respect to need and the resulting discontinuance of assistance" and states that the codes used are "in conformity with the classification" issued by the Social Security Administration. These reasons classify cases into major groups as follows:

1. Those closed because of death.
2. Those no longer eligible with respect to need.
3. Those no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need.
4. Those transferred to other assistance programs.
5. Those closed for other reasons.

Code No. 00 is to be assigned to cases closed because of death, 01 to 54 to cases no longer eligible with respect to need, 71 to 79 to cases no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need, and 90 to 94 to cases transferred to other welfare programs. Code Nos. 54, 79, and 94 are assigned to the general classification of "other" within the second, third, and fourth major groups. Where more than one reason exists for closing a case, the primary code reason is to be assigned.

Our review disclosed that, in 75 of the 127 cases closed, the assigned code reasons for closing the cases were not compatible with what we considered to be the primary reasons for ineligibility. For example, code 79 is required to be used when a case is closed because an eligibility requirement other than need, which is not specifically listed in codes 71-78, is no longer met. The PAD classified 62 of the 127 cases under code 79, whereas, in our opinion, only 23 should have

been so classified. A more meaningful classification in the remaining 39 cases would have been as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
04: ADC mother employed.....	1
11: Return of absent employed father.....	10
74: Return of absent employable father.....	7
73: Parent no longer incapacitated.....	9
72: Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements.....	3
94: Unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable.....	9
Total.....	39

On the other hand, five cases classified under other codes, in our opinion, should have been classified under code 79.

Another example of this situation relates to nine cases which PAD classified under code 90 (voluntary withdrawal when reason for such withdrawal is not known) whereas a more meaningful classification would have placed them in code classifications as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
11: Return of absent employed father.....	1
74: Return of absent employable father.....	1
73: Parent no longer incapacitated.....	1
72: Refusal to comply with eligibility requirements.....	1
79: No continued absence established.....	2
94: Other—unable to determine resources—extent of need undeterminable.....	3

It is significant to note that no code reason is prescribed for those cases closed because a recipient was improperly receiving aid. The code reasons provided imply that the changed circumstances in the recipients' situations arose at a time coincident with the closing of the case. We believe that a code reason should be provided for use in those cases that are closed because the recipient had been improperly receiving assistance. In this way, the cases closed because of improper receipt of assistance could be distinguished from those closed because of changes in recipients' conditions or circumstances.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a September 1962 special report to the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, by the Comptroller General of the United States.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE

INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 1962

(By the Comptroller General of the United States, September 1962)

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, September 6, 1962.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Herewith is our report on the investigation of selected cases under the general public assistance (GPA) program, administered by the Public Assistance Division (PAD), Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, August 1962. We participated in the investigation pursuant to your request of May 3, 1962.

The investigation of 68 GPA cases disclosed that, on the basis of the eligibility requirements and need standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, the recipients in 53, or 78 percent, of the cases were ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program, but that in 13 of the 53 cases the recipients were eligible for assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program.

The results of the investigation lead to the conclusions (1) that the PAD had not taken the required actions necessary to determine whether or not recipients of financial assistance are eligible for continued assistance under the GPA program or are eligible for assistance under another public welfare program, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on recipients to inform the PAD of actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on their eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) the GPA cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving under the GPA program or are eligible for financial assistance under another public welfare program.

We believe, as stated in our earlier report to you on the investigation of selected cases under the aid to dependent children program, that there is a definite need for instituting a continuing field investigation program to determine the eligibility of the recipients of financial assistance under the GPA program for such assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's administration of the program.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

SPECIAL REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF SELECTED CASES UNDER THE GENERAL PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT, AUGUST 1962

The General Accounting Office has participated with the Department of Public Welfare (DPW), District of Columbia government, in an investigation of selected cases administered by its Public Assistance Division (PAD) under the general public assistance (GPA) program to determine the facts having a bearing on the eligibility of the recipients for assistance under the eligibility factors and need standards, as prescribed by the Board of Commissioners, and to establish whether, on the basis of the facts, the recipients are eligible for such assistance. The General Accounting Office participated in the factfinding phase of the investigation pursuant to the request on May 3, 1962, of the chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Senate Committee on Appropriations.

The purpose of the general public assistance program, as indicated in departmental regulations and the PAD Manual, is to provide assistance to needy persons who are unemployable, but who are not eligible for assistance under a program in which the Federal Government participates financially, and to help them, as far as possible, to become self-supporting. The program is conducted under authority contained in appropriation acts for the District of Columbia which provide for the relief and rehabilitation of indigent residents.

The PAD Manual provides that an unemployable person to be eligible for assistance (1) must be between the ages of 16 and 65, (2) must have been a resident of the District of Columbia for at least 1 year, and (3) must lack income or other resources sufficient to meet his subsistence requirements determined on the basis of budget standards prescribed by the Board of Commissioners. The manual defines an unemployable person as one who has a physical or mental disability which precludes him

from working full time, that is, 40 hours a week, in competitive employment. The manual specifically provides that assistance shall be denied to a person who is eligible for benefits under a program but who does not apply for such benefits or who refuses recommended treatment (other than surgery) or rehabilitation services which may aid him in regaining or increasing his earning capacity. The manual contains detailed procedures, criteria, and instructions for determining the eligibility of a person for public assistance and the amount of the assistance.

The Department of Public Welfare investigation of the GPA cases in which we participated was undertaken pursuant to a request of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in its report on H.R. 8072,¹ a bill to provide appropriations for the District of Columbia for 1962. That request pertained also to an investigation of aid to dependent children (ADC) cases in which we participated and submitted a report (B-25435) on July 26, 1962, to the chairman, Subcommittees on the District of Columbia, Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, pursuant to a request on March 6, 1962. The planning, direction, and conduct of the investigation of the GPA cases were carried out generally along the same lines as those set forth in the aforementioned report on the investigation of the ADC cases.

INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS AND ACTIONS TAKEN

The PAD Office of Research and Statistics selected for investigation—on a random sampling basis—80 cases from the March 1962 GPA welfare rolls exclusive of cases involving incompetents, persons in foster or nursing homes, and Cuban refugees, which cases were specifically exempted from the scope of the requested investigation. Of these cases, nine had been closed prior to the commencement in June 1962 of the investigation and three cases were not investigated—two cases because the recipients were incompetent and one case because the recipient lived outside the District of Columbia. Therefore, the investigation actually pertained to 68 cases—approximately 5 percent of the GPA caseload exclusive of cases exempted from the scope of the investigation.

By August 21, 1962, the PAD had informed us that their eligibility determinations, based on the investigative findings and certain events occurring subsequent to the investigation, had resulted in the following actions with respect to the 68 cases investigated:

	Number of cases	Percent of total cases
Financial payments continued under the GPA program but adjustments considered necessary:		
Adjustments in payments based on existing need.....	6	-----
Miscellaneous administrative adjustments.....	7	-----
Total.....	13	19
Financial payments discontinued under the GPA program:		
Ineligible for public assistance.....	40	-----
Eligible for public assistance but under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program.....	13	-----
Total.....	53	78
Financial payments suspended under the GPA program pending:		
Submission of medical information.....	1	-----
Definite determination of resources.....	1	-----
Total.....	2	3
Grand total.....	68	100

¹S. Rept. 993, 87th Cong.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS CONTINUED UNDER THE GPA PROGRAM

The investigation disclosed information which resulted in the PAD's determining that the recipients in 13, or 19 percent, of the 68 cases investigated are eligible for continued financial assistance. However, adjustments in the amount of the assistance payments were necessary in six cases and some administrative action was required in seven cases to bring them into conformity with the PAD Manual requirements.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS DISCONTINUED UNDER THE GPA PROGRAM

The PAD determined that in 53 cases the recipients were ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program—in 51 cases on the basis of investigative findings and in two cases on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation, but that in 13 of the 53 cases the recipients were eligible for assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD) program. The investigation disclosed that these 13 cases either had not been referred to the medical review team (MRT) for a determination of eligibility under the APTD program or had not been transferred to the APTD program upon the MRT's determination of eligibility under that program.

The 38 cases in which the recipients were determined by the PAD to be ineligible for financial assistance under the GPA program on the basis of the investigative findings are classified in the following table according to the investigative finding which, in our opinion, had the most significant bearing on the recipient's eligibility.

Recipients	Number of cases
Employed.....	12
Employable.....	6
Resources undeterminable and/or unreported.....	12
In District hospitals.....	3
Failure to cooperate.....	4
Failure to meet resident requirement.....	1
Total.....	38

RECIPIENTS EMPLOYED

The investigation disclosed that the recipients of financial assistance in 12 cases were employed—in 5 cases full time and in 7 cases part time. The earnings of two recipients who were employed part time were equal to, or in excess of, their subsistence requirements computed on the basis of the prescribed standards. The earnings of the other five recipients who were employed part time could not be determined.

The PAD Manual, in section 352.321, provides that a recipient who is able to work part time and who is engaged in an occupation where it is not possible to obtain accurate, reliable information concerning the amount of his earnings shall be ineligible for assistance. The Manual, in section 350.000, provides also that a recipient who refuses to, or does not, clarify the extent of his earnings shall be ineligible for assistance.

The PAD determined, on the basis of the investigative findings, that the 12 recipients were ineligible for continued financial assistance—in 5 cases because the recipients were employed full time, in 2 cases where the recipients were employed part time because there was no need for assistance, and in 5 cases where the recipients were employed part time because the need for assistance could not be established.

RECIPIENTS EMPLOYABLE

The investigation disclosed five cases where the recipients were receiving financial assistance and one case where the financial assistance payments to the recipient had been temporarily suspended although the case files contained no evidence that their eligibility for such assistance had been reestablished as required by the PAD Manual.

The Manual, in section 245.130, requires that the eligibility of a recipient for financial assistance under the GPA program must be reestablished periodically on the basis of a medical determination of unemployability.

The PAD subsequently obtained current medical reports for the six recipients and on the basis of an evaluation of the reports determined that they were employable and no longer eligible for financial assistance. The payments were thereupon discontinued.

RECIPIENTS' RESOURCES UNDETERMINABLE AND/OR UNREPORTED

The investigation disclosed evidence in 12 cases where the recipients had available resources that had not been reported to the PAD. Also, the extent of such resources could not be determined. The recipients in two cases had obtained part-time employment in performing odd jobs, in two cases either were receiving or were eligible to receive statutory benefits equal to the amount of their assistance payments, and in the remaining eight cases either were living on a scale beyond that possible under the financial assistance being provided, were obtaining assistance from relatives or friends, or had other resources.

In each of these cases, the recipients were either unwilling or unable to clarify their resources. Therefore it was impossible to definitely establish that a need for financial assistance existed. The PAD Manual, in section 350.000, specifically provides that in such situations assistance shall be denied to recipients.

RECIPIENTS IN DISTRICT HOSPITALS

The investigation disclosed three cases that had not been closed although the recipients had been admitted to a public institution for an indefinite or indeterminate period—two to the Glenn Dale Hospital and one to the District of Columbia General Hospital.

RECIPIENTS' FAILURE TO COOPERATE

The investigation disclosed four cases where the facts clearly showed that the recipients were ineligible for continued financial assistance under the GPA program because they had not kept the PAD informed of their whereabouts and/or refused to accept rehabilitation services. A synopsis of these four cases follows:

1. The investigation disclosed that since December 1961 the recipient had not lived at the address of record in the case file to which the monthly assistance payment checks had been mailed up to May 1962 when payments were suspended pending a redetermination of eligibility for continued assistance. As a result of the investigative finding, the PAD discontinued assistance on the basis of "loss of contact." Since December 1960, the date of the last PAD approval of the recipient's eligibility for financial assistance, the recipient had been arrested 12 times for drunkenness, disorderly conduct, or other charges, the latest arrest for drunkenness, which occurred during the period of the investigation, resulting in his being sentenced to the Occoquan Workhouse for 30 days.

2. The investigation resulted in locating the recipient's husband and in the recommendation to the PAD that he be contacted with regard to supporting his wife. The investigation disclosed also certain questionable circumstances surrounding the recipient's relationship with another man. The PAD attempted to follow up on these investigative leads but was unable to establish contact with the recipient either at her home or, as requested, at the PAD office. The PAD therefore closed the case on the basis that a determination of continued need could not be established.

3. The investigation disclosed that the recipient did not live at the address of record in the case file and that he had been employed under a different name for a 2-week period at a rate of \$45 a week but had quit

the job because of the low rate of pay. Subsequently he was arrested for attempting to set the house in which he lived on fire and sentenced to confinement in the District of Columbia jail for 90 days. The PAD closed the case on the basis that the recipient had refused reasonable employment.

4. The recipient in this case was a known alcoholic, and the assistance payments were made to a vendor payee on his behalf. The vendor payee improperly retained and cashed assistance checks while the recipient was confined in jail for drunkenness. The designation of the vendor payee as a responsible person to act for the recipient is questionable since, aside from his improper retention and cashing of assistance payment checks, he has been arrested twice for keeping and selling liquor. The recipient has a record of 184 arrests—136 arrests for drunkenness including 4 arrests since August 1961 when he was determined by the PAD to be eligible for financial assistance. The medical review team had determined that the recipient is employable on a full-time basis in a job where he would be potentially dangerous neither to himself nor to others. However, the PAD had not referred the recipient either to the U.S. Employment Service for possible employment or to the District Department of Vocational Rehabilitation for rehabilitative services. He refused to accept a referral to the Municipal Lodging House for a "drying out" period. The PAD closed the case on July 31, 1962, on the basis that the whereabouts of the recipient was unknown since his release from jail on July 23, 1962.

RECIPIENT'S FAILURE TO MEET RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

The investigation disclosed one case where the recipient of financial assistance under the GPA program was not eligible for such assistance at the time he applied for the assistance because he had not lived in the District for 1 year immediately preceding his application for assistance, an eligibility requirement prescribed in section 231.135 of the PAD Manual. The Investigative Unit immediately notified the PAD that the recipient had not met the residence requirement. However, the PAD reinstated financial payments to the recipient for an adjustment period of 1 month following his discharge from the hospital on June 22, 1962, as employable, solely on the basis of the recipient's statement that he had been out of the District for only 2 or 3 weeks during the year preceding his application for assistance. The investigative unit did not concur with this action and furnished the PAD with additional proof that the recipient had been employed in Norfolk, Va., during the year in which he had claimed to have resided in the District. Thereupon, the PAD determined that the entire amount of financial assistance that had been provided to the recipient during the period from January 1962, when he was initially determined to have been eligible for assistance, through July 1962, when the assistance payments were discontinued, should be recovered on the basis that the assistance had been fraudulently obtained.

DELAYS IN TAKING REQUIRED ACTIONS

The investigation disclosed that the PAD had not required some recipients under the GPA program to submit medical reports and had not referred the cases to the medical review team for determination of the recipients' unemployability or for consideration of their eligibility for financial assistance under the aid to the permanently and totally disabled program as required by the PAD Manual.

The manual states, in section 245.130, that: "General public assistance is considered primarily as assistance to individuals whose unemployability will be of short duration. When, in making redeterminations of

continuing eligibility, the worker has received two or more medical reports indicating that unemployability still exists, and assistance has been continued for as long as 6 months, the case must be referred to the review team for recommendations and/or consideration of eligibility for APTD."

In section 244.135, that: "The worker is responsible for setting his controls in such a way that he will be reminded of the case in time to obtain a new medical report and to prepare a revised social information report in time for whatever review date the team had set for the next team evaluation of the case."

In section 244.134, that: "The social worker is responsible for seeing that all recommendations of the review team are carried out promptly, i.e., within 30 days after the action was recommended."

The 53 cases where financial assistance payments were discontinued under the GPA program, as a result of the investigation, include: 13 cases that had not been referred to the MRT, after the recipients had received assistance for 6 months, for periods from 2 to 20 months beyond the required referral dates; 9 cases that had not been resubmitted to the MRT for periods ranging from 1 to 19 months beyond the specified resubmission dates; 7 cases where action recommended by MRT had not been taken for periods ranging from 2 to 5 months.

Of these 29 cases, the PAD determined (1) on the basis of investigative findings, that the recipients in 15 cases were ineligible for any financial assistance, (2) on the basis of referrals that were made to MRT following notification by the investigative unit, that the recipients in 13 cases were not eligible for assistance under the GPA program but were eligible for assistance under the APTD program, and (3) on the basis of events occurring subsequent to the investigation, that the recipient in 1 case was not eligible for assistance. The referral of GPA cases to MRT within the prescribed time requirements and the prompt taking of the recommended action would have undoubtedly resulted in an earlier transfer of the 13 cases to the APTD program and an earlier discontinuance of payments in the 7 cases where the recipients were determined to be employable. The ineligibility of the recipients for assistance in the remaining 8 cases was ascertainable only by field investigation.

CONCLUSIONS

The results of the investigation of the 68 GPA cases lead to conclusions similar to those set forth in our report on investigation

of selected cases under the ADC program, referred to on page 3 of this report; namely, (1) that the PAD had not taken the required actions necessary to determine whether or not recipients of financial assistance are eligible for continued assistance under the GPA program or are eligible for assistance under another public welfare program, (2) that reliance cannot be placed on recipients to inform the PAD of actual conditions or circumstances which have a bearing on their eligibility for financial assistance, and (3) the GPA cases not covered in the current investigation should be investigated to determine whether or not the recipients are eligible for the financial assistance they are receiving under the GPA program or are eligible for financial assistance under another public welfare program.

We believe, as stated in the aforementioned report, that there is a definite need for instituting a continuing field investigation program with the objective of investigating GPA cases for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the recipients for financial assistance and the effectiveness of the PAD's administration of the GPA program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the ADC monthly caseload trend for the fiscal years 1960 through 1963 and extending through the first 4 months of fiscal year 1964.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADC MONTHLY CASELOAD TREND Monthly caseload trend, ADC, fiscal years 1960-62

1959 (fiscal year 1960):			
July	3,860		
August	3,874		
September	3,884		
October	3,955		
November	3,992		
December	4,091		
January	4,158		
February	4,288		
March	4,406		
April	4,433		
May	4,501		
June	4,578		
1960 (fiscal year 1961):			
July	4,650		
August	4,762		

Monthly caseload trend, ADC, fiscal years 1960-62—Continued

1960 (fiscal year 1961):	
September	4,809
October	4,884
November	4,955
December	5,003
January	5,078
February	5,166
March	5,285
April	5,323
May	5,431
June	5,481
1961 (fiscal year 1962):	
July	5,530
August	5,597
September	5,601
October	5,607
November	5,628
December	5,611
January	5,553
February	5,471
March	5,392
April	5,251
May	5,111
June	4,976
1962 (fiscal year 1963):	
July	4,849
August	4,757
September	4,615
October	4,491
November	4,396
December	4,353
January	4,262
February	4,184
March	4,189
April	4,157
May	4,155
June	4,062
1963 (fiscal year 1964):	
July	4,063
August	3,949
September	3,857
October	3,823

¹ Special investigation ADC began Nov. 13, 1961.

² General Accounting Office entered ADC investigation Mar. 14, 1962.

³ ADC investigation completed May 1, 1962.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the families receiving AFDC assistance for specified periods of time, as of June 1963.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LISTING OF FAMILIES RECEIVING AFDC IN JUNE 1963, BY LENGTH OF TIME RECEIVING ASSISTANCE CONTINUOUSLY Summary of AFDC families receiving assistance for specified periods of time, as of June 1963

Length of time receiving assistance	Number of cases	Amount received			Number of persons in assistance unit			
		Total	Federal	Local	Total persons	Adults	Children	
							Total	Illegitimate
Total	3,908	\$609,438	\$422,310.50	\$187,127.50	18,783	3,887	14,896	6,181
Less than 1 year	716	99,806	71,219.50	28,586.50	3,284	738	2,546	844
1 year, less than 2	632	93,098	65,026.50	28,071.50	2,942	620	2,322	942
2 years, less than 3	667	103,901	71,986.50	31,914.50	3,217	664	2,553	1,121
3 years, less than 4	541	86,011	59,460.50	26,550.50	2,638	523	2,115	880
4 years, less than 5	417	65,039	45,107.00	19,932.00	2,009	393	1,616	704
5 years, less than 6	353	57,344	38,955.50	18,388.50	1,706	320	1,386	609
6 years, less than 7	207	34,665	23,626.50	11,038.50	1,029	203	826	379
7 years, less than 8	111	16,509	11,150.00	5,359.00	476	98	378	139
8 years, less than 9	79	12,097	7,998.00	4,099.00	329	74	255	114
9 years, less than 10	68	10,840	7,242.00	3,498.00	309	66	243	102
10 years, less than 11	55	7,868	5,482.50	2,385.50	238	54	184	82
11 years, less than 12	20	2,750	1,879.50	870.50	81	18	63	22
12 years, less than 13	22	3,255	2,251.50	1,003.50	90	20	70	42
13 years, less than 14	20	2,925	1,861.50	1,063.50	72	17	55	35
14 years, less than 15	33	5,177	3,421.50	1,755.50	136	28	108	50
15 years, less than 16	20	2,465	1,736.50	748.50	73	16	57	33
16 years, less than 17	15	2,420	1,641.50	778.50	68	14	54	41
17 years, less than 18	11	1,517	1,068.00	449.00	45	10	35	20
18 years, less than 19	7	1,140	718.50	421.50	27	7	20	15
19 years, less than 20	1	140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4
20 years, less than 21	1	208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	1
21 years, less than 22	2	243	143.50	99.50	4	2	2	2

Receiving assistance less than 1 year

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$154	\$99.00	\$55.00	4	1	3	2	\$134	\$83.50	\$50.50	3	1	2	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
\$142	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	5	\$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	3	\$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	2
\$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	3	\$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	1
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$125	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	0
\$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	2	\$52	41.00	11.00	2	1	1	1
\$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	6	\$84	82.00	2.00	4	0	4	0
\$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2	\$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	0
\$134	123.00	11.00	6	1	5	4	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2
\$224	205.00	19.00	10	2	8	0	\$192	143.50	48.50	7	1	6	0
\$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	1	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	1	\$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0
\$263	184.50	78.50	9	1	8	2	\$214	164.00	50.00	8	1	7	3
\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	3
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	\$239	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	0
\$127	123.00	4.00	6	1	5	0	\$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	0	\$282	157.50	124.50	3	1	2	1
\$91	62.00	29.00	3	1	2	2	\$241	164.50	76.50	8	1	7	7
\$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2	\$170	123.00	47.00	6	2	4	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$163	109.00	54.00	5	1	4	4
\$18	18.00	0	3	1	2	2	\$71	41.00	30.00	1	0	1	0
\$161	143.50	17.50	7	1	6	6	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
\$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	2	\$86	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
\$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	0	\$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	0
\$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$197	115.00	82.00	3	1	2	0
\$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	1	\$115	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	3
\$112	102.50	9.50	5	1	4	4	\$99	99.00	0	5	2	3	0
\$79	79.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
\$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	1	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
\$128	86.00	42.00	4	2	2	0	\$72	41.50	30.50	1	0	1	1
\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4	\$131	82.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
\$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	2	\$116	116.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	0	\$157	123.00	34.00	6	2	4	4
\$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3	\$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0
\$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1	\$106	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	1
\$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	1	\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0	\$104	104.00	0	7	1	6	6
\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0	\$175	123.00	52.00	6	2	4	0
\$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	1	\$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0
\$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	4	\$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	1
\$115	115.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$280	189.50	90.50	9	2	7	4
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	0
\$155	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	3	\$183	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	4	1	3	0	\$184	143.50	40.50	7	2	5	0
\$70	70.00	0	4	2	2	0	\$214	145.50	68.50	7	1	6	0
\$187	184.50	2.50	9	1	8	0	\$87	87.00	0	7	1	6	0
\$110	110.00	0	9	1	8	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$105	68.00	37.00	3	1	2	2	\$75	61.50	13.50	3	2	1	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0	\$184	119.50	64.50	5	2	3	0
\$27	27.00	0	4	1	3	1	\$16	16.00	0	4	2	2	0
\$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	0	\$147	90.00	57.00	3	2	1	1
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$139	139.00	0	9	1	8	1	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$214	214.00	0	1	1	12	1	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$195	125.00	70.00	5	2	3	0
\$109	109.00	0	6	1	5	1	\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
\$78	78.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4	\$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	2
\$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	1	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	0
\$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	0	\$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	2
\$149	143.50	5.50	7	1	6	6	\$94	63.50	30.50	3	2	1	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0	\$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1	\$179	111.50	67.50	4	2	2	0
\$67	61.50	5.50	3	0	3	2	\$46	46.00	0	6	2	4	4
\$97	82.00	15.00	4	0	4	0	\$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
\$67	67.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	0
\$173	108.50	64.50	4	2	2	2	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0	\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	3
\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	1	\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	0
\$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	2	\$143	102.50	40.50	5	1	4	0
\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$103	103.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0
\$138	138.00	0	7	1	6	6	\$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	3
\$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$48	29.50	18.50	1	0	1	1
\$186	126.00	60.00	6	2	4	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	\$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	4
\$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0	\$254	171.00	83.00	8	0	8	3
\$52	52.00	0	5	1	4	1	\$80	51.00	29.00	2	0	2	0
\$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	3	\$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	1
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0
\$226	146.00	80.00	6	1	5	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	\$83	61.50	21.50	3	1	2	0
\$15	15.00	0	2	1	1	1	\$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$107	\$64.50	\$42.50	2	1	1	1	\$118	\$70.00	\$48.00	2	1	1	1
\$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	2	\$202	195.50	96.50	9	2	7	1
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1	\$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	0
\$173	123.00	50.00	6	2	4	0	\$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	0
\$240	158.50	81.50	7	2	5	0	\$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	0
\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0	\$102	102.00	0	7	2	5	0
\$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	0	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	1	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	3	\$49	41.00	8.00	2	1	1	0
\$41	41.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	0	\$58	58.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	2
\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0	\$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	1
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0	\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	2
\$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	1	\$142	142.00	0	7	1	6	0
\$200	143.50	66.50	7	2	5	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0	\$158	123.00	35.00	6	1	5	3
\$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	1	\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
\$91	91.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	2
\$63	42.00	21.00	2	0	2	2	\$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	1
\$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	1
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1
\$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1
\$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$93	57.50	35.50	2	0	2	0
\$241	164.50	76.50	8	2	6	0	\$302	200.50	101.50	9	2	7	0
\$151	97.50	53.50	4	1	3	1	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$34	34.00	0	2	1	1	1	\$31	31.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$78	78.00	0	6	2	4	1	\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7
\$32	32.00	0	4	1	3	2	\$144	94.00	50.00	4	0	4	0
\$77	61.50	15.50	3	1	2	1	\$275	187.00	88.00	9	2	7	0
\$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	1	\$162	162.00	0	9	2	7	0
\$108	108.00	0	7	2	5	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	2	\$82	61.50	20.50	3	0	3	2
\$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	0	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	6	\$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	0
\$96	82.00	14.00	4	1	3	3	\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	0
\$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	0	\$59	59.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$81	61.50	19.50	3	1	2	0	\$239	184.50	54.50	9	1	8	4
\$196	125.50	70.50	5	2	3	0	\$106	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	2
\$61	61.00	0	4	1	3	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$248	162.00	85.50	7	1	6	0	\$167	111.00	56.00	5	1	4	0
\$33	33.00	0	4	2	2	0	\$65	65.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$74	61.50	12.50	3	2	1	0	\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$298	205.00	93.00	10	1	9	0
\$155	97.00	58.00	4	2	2	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
\$101	67.00	34.00	3	2	1	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$29	29.00	0	3	1	2	2	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$21	21.00	0	1	0	1	1	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$65	61.50	3.50	3	1	2	1	\$50	41.00	9.00	2	0	2	0
\$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1	\$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	\$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	3
\$27	27.00	0	3	1	2	2	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1	\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$49	49.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$200	127.50	72.50	5	1	4	0
\$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	4	\$215	146.00	69.00	7	1	6	0
\$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	0	\$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	2
\$83	83.00	0	5	0	5	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
\$73	47.50	25.50	2	1	1	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0	\$82	52.00	30.00	2	0	2	0
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0	\$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	3
\$106	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	1	\$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	3	1	2	0
\$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	1
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
\$327	218.50	108.50	10	1	9	0	\$230	142.50	87.50	5	0	5	4
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$44	44.00	0	3	1	2	2
\$162	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	2	\$191	123.00	68.00	5	0	5	0
\$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	4	\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
\$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	3	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$144	123.00	21.00	6	1	5	1	\$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
\$89	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	2	\$182	124.00	58.00	6	1	5	3
\$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0	\$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	1
\$112	82.00	30.00	4	2	2	2	\$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1
\$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$199	199.00	0	11	2	9	0
\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	4	\$69	69.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$196	131.00	65.00	6	2	4	4	\$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
\$65	61.50	3.50	3	1	2	0	\$47	47.00	0	3	2	1	0
\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	1	\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0
\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4	\$222	144.00	78.00	6	2	4	3
\$53	53.00	0	3	1	2	2	\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	0
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	1	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
\$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0	\$181	181.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$107	70.00	37.00	3	1	2	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$187	110.00	77.00	3	1	2	0	\$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	1
\$8	8.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3
\$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	2	\$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	2
\$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	0	\$133	133.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$279	205.00	74.00	10	1	9	1	\$90	82.00	8.00	4	0	4	4
\$78	50.00	28.00	2	0	2	2	\$223	150.00	72.00	7	1	6	0
\$251	153.00	98.00	5	1	4	0	\$105	102.50	2.50	5	0	4	1
\$238	157.50	80.50	7	1	6	0	\$52	52.00	0	3	1	2	2
\$185	114.50	70.50	4	1	3	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	1
\$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	0	\$165	99.00	66.00	3	1	2	2
\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	0	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	2	4	1
\$94	36.00	58.00	0	2	2	0	\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$127	\$85.50	\$41.50	4	1	3	1	\$240	\$158.50	\$81.50	7	2	5	3
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$230	153.50	76.50	7	1	6	1
\$84	84.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$220	205.00	15.00	10	1	9	2
\$164	98.50	65.50	3	1	2	0	\$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	2
\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$46	28.50	17.50	1	0	1	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$36	23.50	12.50	1	0	1	1	\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	1
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0	\$87	61.50	25.50	3	1	2	0
\$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	0	\$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	4
\$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0	\$228	152.50	75.50	7	1	6	2
\$350	202.50	147.50	5	1	4	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$40	40.00	0	3	1	2	0	\$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	0
\$314	212.00	102.00	10	2	8	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$64	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	0	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	0
\$105	69.00	36.00	3	0	3	0	\$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	4
\$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	3	\$223	205.00	18.00	10	1	9	1
\$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0	\$93	93.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$296	205.00	91.00	10	2	8	0
\$120	120.00	0	8	1	7	4	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$193	143.50	49.50	7	1	6	0	\$232	164.00	68.00	8	1	7	1
\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$132	82.50	49.50	3	2	1	1
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
\$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3	\$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	2
\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$54	41.00	13.00	2	1	1	0
\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1	\$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	0
\$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0	\$190	128.00	62.00	6	2	4	4
\$175	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	4	\$66	66.00	0	8	1	7	1
\$43	43.00	0	3	1	2	0	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	\$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	1
\$144	143.50	50.50	7	1	6	0	\$185	120.00	65.00	5	1	4	1
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$124	102.50	21.50	5	1	4	2
\$58	38.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$180	180.00	0	9	2	7	2
\$113	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$68	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	0
\$40	25.50	14.50	1	0	1	1	\$148	143.50	4.50	7	2	5	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	4
\$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	1	\$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0
\$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	0	\$54	54.00	0	8	1	7	2
\$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0	\$155	123.00	32.00	6	1	5	0
\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1	\$128	86.00	42.00	4	0	4	0
\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	\$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	2
\$104	102.50	1.50	5	1	4	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	0	\$40	40.00	0	4	1	3	1
\$165	164.00	1.00	8	1	7	0	\$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	0
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$206	136.00	70.00	6	1	5	5
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2	\$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
\$89	82.00	7.00	4	1	3	3	\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	1
\$183	164.00	19.00	8	2	6	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$65	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0
\$136	79.00	57.00	2	1	1	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1
\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4	\$228	162.50	75.50	7	1	6	0
\$84	82.00	2.00	4	0	4	1	\$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	5
\$82	82.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0
\$37	24.00	13.00	1	0	1	0	\$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	2
\$67	61.50	5.50	3	2	1	0	\$199	184.50	14.50	9	1	8	3
\$362	208.50	153.50	5	1	4	0	\$93	57.50	35.50	2	1	1	1
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	\$212	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	6
\$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0	\$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	0
\$170	112.50	57.50	5	2	3	0	\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
\$68	45.00	23.00	2	1	1	1	\$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	3
\$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	0	\$72	72.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$105	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	0	\$124	84.00	40.00	4	1	3	3
\$184	116.50	64.50	5	2	3	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$63	42.50	20.50	2	1	1	1
\$50	30.50	19.50	1	0	1	0	\$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	0
\$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	1	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$57	34.00	23.00	1	0	1	1	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6
\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	0	\$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
\$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	1	\$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	6
\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0	\$175	123.00	52.00	6	1	5	5
\$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2	\$168	168.00	0	9	1	8	0
\$82	52.00	30.00	2	0	2	2	\$135	135.00	0	7	1	6	6
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	1
\$191	143.50	47.50	7	2	5	0	\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	6
\$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	0	\$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0
\$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	0	\$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$282	190.50	91.50	9	1	8	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
\$196	131.00	65.00	6	2	4	0	\$110	110.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	2
\$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	0	\$95	58.50	26.50	2	0	2	2
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	3	\$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
\$84	82.00	2.00	4	2	2	0	\$119	119.00	0	6	1	5	1
\$132	132.00	0	7	1	6	4	\$303	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	3
\$200	133.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$117	82.00	35.00	4	2	2	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$161	123.00	38.00	6	1	5	0	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2
\$98	82.00	16.00	4	1	3	3	\$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	3
\$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	2	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
\$191	128.50	62.50	5	1	4	0	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$157	143.50	13.50	7	1	6	0	\$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$219	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	0	\$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1
\$45	28.00	17.00	1	0	1	1	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1
\$169	123.00	46.00	6	1	5	5	\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
							\$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance less than 1 year—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$154	\$99.00	\$55.00	4	1	3	1	\$294	\$180.00	\$114.00	6	1	5	0
\$350	260.50	89.50	13	2	11	0	\$58	58.00	0	6	1	5	5
\$181	115.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$80	89.00	0	8	2	6	0
\$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0	\$208	164.00	44.00	8	1	7	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	1	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$105	105.00	0	9	1	8	0
\$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	0	\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0
\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	0	\$163	163.00	0	9	2	7	0
\$67	67.00	0	8	1	7	0	\$115	115.00	0	7	1	6	2
\$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	0	\$200	127.50	72.50	5	0	5	0
\$135	135.00	0	7	1	6	4	\$65	43.50	21.50	2	1	1	1
\$62	42.00	20.00	2	1	1	1	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
\$336	228.50	107.50	11	2	9	0	\$246	225.50	20.50	11	2	9	5
\$100	100.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3
\$162	123.00	39.00	6	1	5	2	\$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0
\$101	101.00	0	7	1	6	1	\$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	1
\$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$224	184.00	40.00	9	2	7	0
\$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	3	\$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	3
\$98	98.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$207	136.50	70.50	6	1	5	3
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1	\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1
\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2	\$167	123.00	44.00	6	1	5	1
\$85	85.00	0	5	1	4	3	\$132	132.00	0	7	1	6	3
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	5
\$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0	\$75	75.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2	\$90	82.00	8.00	4	1	3	0
\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1	\$70	70.00	0	5	1	4	4
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	0	\$165	123.00	42.00	6	1	5	1
\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0	\$240	158.50	81.50	7	2	5	4
\$298	195.50	99.50	9	2	7	0	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$136	102.50	33.50	5	1	4	0	\$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	3	\$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	1
\$228	147.00	81.00	6	1	5	5	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
\$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	1	\$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	0
\$318	186.50	131.50	5	1	4	0	\$167	111.00	56.00	5	1	4	4
\$249	184.50	64.50	9	2	7	2	\$143	123.00	20.00	6	1	5	2
\$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	1	\$79	75.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$114	102.50	11.50	5	1	4	2
\$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0	\$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1
\$59	41.00	18.00	2	1	1	1	\$66	61.50	4.50	3	0	3	0
\$182	107.50	74.50	3	1	2	2	\$96	82.00	14.00	4	1	3	3
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2	\$223	144.50	78.50	6	1	5	5
\$66	61.50	4.50	3	1	2	1	\$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	2
\$190	190.00	0	11	2	9	0	\$161	102.50	58.50	4	2	2	2
\$50	50.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$292	195.50	96.50	9	2	7	0
\$66	66.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$216	146.50	69.50	7	1	6	0
\$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	1	\$212	139.00	73.00	6	1	5	5
\$50	30.50	19.50	1	0	1	0	\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
\$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	0	\$143	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	1	\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2
\$164	164.00	0	9	2	7	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$129	129.00	0	8	1	7	1
\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0	\$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
\$287	182.00	105.00	7	1	6	2	\$114	102.50	11.50	5	2	3	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$180	164.00	16.00	8	2	6	0
\$147	60.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	\$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	0
\$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	0	\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
\$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1	\$399	224.50	114.50	10	1	9	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$60	\$60.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$134	\$83.50	\$50.50	3	1	2	2
\$187	121.00	\$66.00	5	2	3	0	\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	3
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	0
\$215	146.00	69.00	7	2	5	0	\$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1	\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	0
\$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1	\$226	151.50	74.50	7	1	6	0
\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
\$118	118.00	0	8	1	7	5	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	\$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	1
\$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1	\$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	1
\$66	44.00	22.00	2	1	1	1	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5	\$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$197	137.00	60.00	7	1	6	2
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4
\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	\$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0
\$111	111.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$61	61.00	0	5	1	4	4
\$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0	\$82	82.00	0	6	2	4	0
\$99	99.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	4
\$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	1	\$113	113.00	0	7	1	6	0
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$92	92.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
\$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	0	\$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	4
\$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
\$52	52.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$96	96.00	0	7	1	6	6
\$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	3	\$197	126.00	71.00	5	1	4	3
\$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	0	\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$175	\$115.00	\$60.00	5	1	4	2	\$44	\$44.00	0	3	0	3	3
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	1	\$99	82.00	\$17.00	4	1	3	0
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0
\$191	164.00	27.00	8	2	6	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$259	184.50	74.50	9	1	8	0	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$142	142.00	0	9	1	8	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$133	133.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$83	82.00	1.00	4	1	3	1	\$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	0
\$118	118.00	0	9	1	8	3	\$137	137.00	0	9	1	8	0
\$130	130.00	0	7	2	5	4	\$196	131.00	65.00	6	1	5	0
\$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$65	43.50	21.50	2	1	1	1	\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0
\$189	122.00	67.00	5	1	4	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$63	63.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	3	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$293	205.00	88.00	10	1	9	0	\$327	230.00	97.00	3	1	2	0
\$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	9	\$75	43.00	32.00	1	0	1	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	2	1	0	\$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	\$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	0
\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	5	\$100	82.00	18.00	4	1	3	0
\$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	0	\$222	164.00	58.00	8	1	7	0
\$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2	\$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	0
\$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$307	225.50	81.50	11	1	10	10	\$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	0
\$191	191.00	0	10	1	9	0	\$87	87.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$93	82.00	11.00	4	0	4	0	\$275	187.00	88.00	9	1	8	0
\$240	158.50	81.50	7	1	6	6	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$136	90.00	46.00	4	1	3	0	\$276	187.50	88.50	9	1	8	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	0
\$291	173.00	118.00	5	1	4	1	\$88	88.00	0	6	0	6	3
\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	\$170	123.00	47.00	6	1	5	0
\$115	88.50	46.50	2	1	1	0	\$337	229.00	108.00	11	1	10	1
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0	\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	\$94	94.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	\$105	105.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$197	149.50	47.50	6	1	5	0
\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0	\$227	164.00	63.00	8	1	7	0
\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	4	\$132	123.00	9.00	6	1	5	0
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	\$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	0
\$103	68.00	35.00	3	1	2	2	\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	0
\$119	102.50	16.50	5	1	4	4	\$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	0
\$103	82.00	21.00	4	1	3	3	\$173	143.50	29.50	7	2	5	0
\$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
\$213	164.00	49.00	8	1	7	6	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
\$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	1	\$228	184.50	43.50	9	1	8	0
\$216	141.00	75.00	6	1	5	5	\$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	0
\$235	164.00	71.00	8	1	7	4	\$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	0
\$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0	\$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	0
\$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0	\$353	246.00	107.00	12	1	11	0
\$94	63.50	30.50	3	1	2	0	\$23	23.00	0	2	1	1	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	0
\$226	151.50	74.50	7	1	6	2	\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
\$98	60.00	38.00	2	0	2	0	\$230	164.00	66.00	8	1	7	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3	\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	3	\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0
\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$29	29.00	0	7	2	5	0	\$122	122.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	5	1	4	1	\$5	5.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$131	102.50	28.50	6	1	5	2	\$128	128.00	0	9	2	7	0
\$246	205.00	41.00	10	1	9	4	\$46	41.00	5.00	2	1	1	0
\$109	102.50	6.50	5	1	4	0	\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	0
\$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	3	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$39	25.00	14.00	1	0	1	1	\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	0
\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4	\$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	0
\$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	2	\$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	0
\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	3	\$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$127	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	0
\$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	1	\$171	143.00	28.00	7	1	6	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	\$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
\$46	41.00	5.00	2	0	2	0	\$239	164.00	75.00	8	1	7	0
\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
\$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0	\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
\$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	5	\$48	41.00	7.00	2	0	2	0
\$193	184.50	8.50	9	1	8	7	\$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	0
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	5	\$91	56.50	34.50	2	0	2	0
\$83	82.50	30.50	2	0	2	2	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$215	146.00	69.00	7	2	5	2	\$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	0
\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1	\$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	0
\$78	61.50	16.50	3	0	3	0	\$168	123.00	45.00	6	1	5	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$87	87.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	2	\$108	82.00	26.00	4	1	3	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	3	\$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	0
\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	0
\$43	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2	\$59	59.00	0	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$172	\$97.00	\$75.00	2	1	1	1	\$133	\$83.00	\$50.00	3	1	2	0
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	0	\$89	55.50	33.50	2	0	2	0
\$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	2	\$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0
\$92	92.00	0	8	1	7	0	\$148	96.00	62.00	4	1	3	1
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	2
\$52	31.50	20.50	1	0	1	1	\$201	133.50	67.50	6	2	4	1
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$188	121.50	66.50	5	0	5	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$36	36.00	0	2	1	1	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0	\$234	164.00	70.00	8	2	6	1
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	1	\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1
\$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1	\$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1
\$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	2	\$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	3
\$73	47.50	25.50	2	0	2	2	\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	1
\$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4	\$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	2
\$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0	\$197	126.00	71.00	5	2	3	0
\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0	\$120	120.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$204	176.00	88.00	8	2	6	5	\$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	\$140	89.50	56.50	3	2	1	0
\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	0	\$73	47.50	25.50	2	1	1	0
\$76	61.50	14.50	3	1	2	2	\$23	20.50	2.50	1	0	1	0
\$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	0	\$44	44.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$61	61.00	0	3	1	2	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$34	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	1	\$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
\$178	116.50	61.50	5	2	3	0	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0	\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	0
\$231	164.00	67.00	8	2	6	0	\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
\$75	75.00	0	5	2	3	3	\$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	1
\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1	\$192	164.00	28.00	8	1	7	0
\$107	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	4	\$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0
\$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	1	\$269	178.50	90.50	8	1	7	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$106	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	1
\$252	164.50	87.50	7	2	5	0	\$195	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	4
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0	\$97	59.50	37.50	2	0	2	0
\$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	1	\$67	67.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	1	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$102	102.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3	\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	0
\$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$308	287.00	21.00	14	2	12	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$118	75.00	43.00	3	1	2	2
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$228	152.50	75.50	7	2	5	1
\$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	1	\$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	1
\$189	122.00	67.00	5	1	4	4	\$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	1
\$391	287.00	104.00	14	1	13	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
\$98	60.00	38.00	3	1	2	0	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	2	3	0
\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2	\$40	25.50	14.50	1	0	1	1
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$359	246.00	113.00	12	1	11	11
\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1	\$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	3
\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	0	\$290	225.50	64.50	11	1	10	2
\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2	\$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	1
\$202	128.50	73.50	5	2	3	0	\$31	31.00	0	2	0	2	0
\$90	90.00	0	5	1	4	2	\$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$158	106.50	51.50	4	2	2	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$231	164.00	67.00	8	1	7	0
\$106	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$208	137.00	71.00	6	2	4	0	\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	4
\$247	148.00	99.00	7	1	6	0	\$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
\$59	59.00	0	5	1	4	2	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0	\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	1
\$97	97.00	0	5	1	4	1	\$284	191.50	92.50	9	1	8	0
\$96	64.50	31.50	3	0	3	2	\$164	104.00	60.00	4	1	3	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	0
\$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	2	\$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	1
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1	\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
\$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2
\$49	49.00	0	3	2	1	0	\$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	4
\$148	102.50	45.50	5	2	3	0	\$212	133.50	78.50	5	2	3	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0
\$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	5	\$175	123.00	52.00	6	1	5	0
\$37	24.00	13.00	1	0	1	1	\$299	205.00	94.00	10	1	9	0
\$90	80.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	1
\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2
\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$40	40.00	0	2	0	2	2
\$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	0	\$147	123.00	24.00	6	1	5	4
\$85	61.50	23.50	3	1	2	0	\$275	187.00	88.00	9	2	7	3
\$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
\$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0							

Receiving assistance for 1 year, but less than 2 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$181	\$128.50	\$52.50	6	1	5	2	\$193	\$124.00	\$69.00	5	1	4	1
\$241	150.00	82.00	7	1	6	3	\$121	121.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$170	164.00	6.00	8	1	7	7	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	2
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$201	143.50	57.50	7	1	6	2
\$87	54.50	32.50	2	0	2	0	\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	\$283	205.00	78.00	10	1	9	9
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$67	61.50	5.50	3	1	2	1
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	0	\$201	143.50	57.50	7	1	6	0
\$112	112.00	0	9	1	8	1	\$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
\$47	47.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	0
\$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	2
\$80	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	1	\$109	109.00	0	9	1	8	8
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	7
\$138	85.50	52.50	3	1	2	0	\$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2	\$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	1
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$26	26.00	0	6	1	5	5
\$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	1	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1
\$127	80.00	47.00	3	0	3	3	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
\$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	1	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$112	72.50	39.50	3	0	3	3	\$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	1
\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1	\$119	76.00	43.00	3	1	2	2
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1	\$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	1
\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4	\$138	102.50	33.50	5	1	4	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2	\$273	180.50	92.50	8	1	7	1
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$190	122.50	67.50	5	2	3	0	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	0
\$110	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$137	137.00	0	7	2	5	0
\$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	2	\$237	164.00	73.00	8	2	6	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0
\$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	2	\$194	164.00	30.00	8	1	7	5
\$144	143.50	0.50	7	1	6	6	\$107	107.00	0	8	2	6	4
\$57	57.00	0	5	2	3	0	\$64	64.00	0	5	1	4	3
\$62	62.00	0	7	2	5	0	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	0
\$78	61.50	16.50	3	0	3	7	\$234	155.50	78.50	7	2	5	0
\$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	4	\$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
\$78	50.00	23.00	2	0	2	1	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0	\$125	79.00	46.00	3	0	3	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$67	61.50	5.50	3	1	2	1
\$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	2	\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
\$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	1	\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	1
\$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1	\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	2
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	3	\$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	6
\$291	205.00	86.00	10	1	9	0	\$234	144.50	89.50	5	1	4	2
\$209	205.00	94.00	10	2	8	0	\$108	108.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	2	\$123	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	3
\$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	0	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
\$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	1	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
\$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	4	\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0
\$278	225.50	52.50	11	1	10	0	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$100	82.00	18.00	4	1	3	3	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	2	5	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	2	\$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	5
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	\$280	189.50	90.50	9	2	7	5
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	0	\$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	1
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1	\$30	30.00	0	2	1	1	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	5
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	2	\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1
\$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	4	\$233	175.00	78.00	7	1	6	2
\$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	0	\$210	143.50	66.50	7	1	6	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	\$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	5
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	3
\$136	123.00	13.00	6	1	5	1	\$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	1
\$167	167.00	0	10	1	9	1	\$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	0
\$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	3	\$124	123.00	1.00	6	1	5	2
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	\$174	109.00	65.00	4	1	3	3
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$167	143.50	23.50	7	1	6	0
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	1	1	0	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	0	4	4
\$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	4	\$141	62.50	48.50	4	1	3	3
\$36	36.00	0	4	2	2	0	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	6
\$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	1	\$103	62.50	40.50	2	1	1	1
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	1	\$112	102.50	9.50	5	1	4	4
\$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	0
\$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	5	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
\$132	88.00	44.00	4	1	3	2	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2
\$96	64.50	31.50	3	1	2	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$144	94.00	50.00	4	1	3	3
\$163	163.00	0	8	1	7	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$135	84.00	51.00	3	2	1	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$57	34.00	23.00	1	0	1	1
\$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	6	\$181	112.50	68.50	4	1	3	0
\$204	129.50	74.40	5	1	4	0	\$155	155.00	0	11	2	9	0
\$47	47.00	0	3	2	1	0	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$77	49.50	27.50	2	0	2	2	\$119	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	1
\$84	82.00	2.00	4	2	2	0	\$187	143.50	43.50	7	1	6	4
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	0
\$190	164.00	26.00	8	1	7	0	\$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	4
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$248	146.00	102.00	4	1	3	0
							\$210	184.50	25.50	9	1	8	3

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$144	\$102.50	\$41.50	5	1	4	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2
\$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	\$163	143.50	19.50	7	1	6	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	0
\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	2	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0	\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0
\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	0	\$75	75.00	0	5	1	4	2
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	2
\$107	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0
\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	7	\$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	0
\$128	128.00	0	11	1	10	0	\$225	164.00	61.00	8	1	7	7
\$320	215.00	105.00	10	2	8	0	\$171	113.00	58.00	5	1	4	1
\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	6	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$302	173.00	129.00	4	1	3	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	0	\$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	2
\$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	1	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$257	172.50	84.50	8	1	7	0	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$89	82.00	7.00	4	1	3	0	\$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$109	109.00	0	7	1	6	6
\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2	\$99	82.00	17.00	4	1	3	3
\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4	\$155	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	0
\$137	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	2
\$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	4	\$101	61.50	39.50	2	0	2	1
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	2	\$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	1
\$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	\$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	0
\$149	123.00	26.00	6	1	5	0	\$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	2
\$194	130.00	64.00	6	1	5	3	\$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	2
\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	2	\$77	77.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$123	123.00	0	9	1	8	2
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	3	\$34	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	1
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1	\$183	143.50	39.50	7	1	6	0
\$173	108.50	64.50	4	2	2	2	\$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	2
\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	0	\$197	143.50	53.50	7	1	6	4
\$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	\$245	155.50	89.50	6	1	5	5
\$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$165	110.00	55.00	5	0	5	5	\$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4
\$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	4	\$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	5
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$26	20.50	5.50	1	0	1	1
\$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	0	\$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	1	1
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$177	177.00	0	9	2	7	0
\$147	95.50	51.50	4	1	3	0	\$152	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	0
\$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	4	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$142	93.00	49.00	4	2	2	2
\$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	\$76	76.00	0	7	1	6	0
\$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$160	107.50	52.50	5	1	4	0	\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
\$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	1	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$186	120.50	65.50	5	1	4	0	\$76	61.50	14.50	3	1	2	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	3	\$164	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	3
\$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	2	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$87	87.00	0	6	1	5	5
\$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	0	\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$304	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2
\$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	4	\$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0	\$302	206.00	96.00	10	2	8	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	2
\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2	\$40	25.50	14.50	1	1	4	1
\$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	0	\$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
\$83	52.50	30.50	2	1	1	1	\$133	77.50	55.50	2	1	1	1
\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	\$148	123.00	25.00	6	1	5	1
\$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	3	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	6
\$162	108.50	53.50	5	2	3	0	\$121	77.00	44.00	3	1	2	2
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$146	143.50	2.50	7	1	6	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$240	158.50	81.50	7	0	7	0
\$291	205.00	86.00	10	1	9	0	\$188	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	6
\$118	75.50	42.50	3	1	2	2	\$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	0
\$130	123.00	7.00	6	2	4	4	\$91	56.50	34.50	2	1	1	0
\$107	64.50	42.50	2	1	1	0	\$171	113.00	58.00	5	1	4	4
\$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	1	\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	1
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	2	\$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	0
\$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	0	\$171	143.50	27.50	7	1	6	6
\$151	97.50	53.50	4	0	4	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	1
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
\$191	184.50	6.50	6	1	5	0	\$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	0
\$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	2	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0	\$199	143.50	55.50	7	1	6	6
\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	2	\$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	5
\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1	\$303	206.50	96.50	10	2	8	0
\$202	134.00	68.00	6	2	4	0							

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$187	\$121.50	\$65.50	5	1	4	0	\$154	\$93.50	\$60.50	3	1	2	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$70	46.00	24.00	2	1	1	0
\$138	85.50	52.50	3	1	2	0	\$94	94.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$37	37.00	0	2	1	1	1	\$282	185.00	97.00	8	2	6	0
\$13	13.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$229	205.00	24.00	10	2	8	8	\$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	0
\$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	0	\$142	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	0
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	\$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	0
\$190	143.50	46.50	7	1	6	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	0	\$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	0
\$70	70.00	0	4	0	4	3	\$29	20.50	8.50	1	0	1	0
\$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	3	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	1
\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0	\$29	20.50	8.50	1	0	1	0
\$153	98.50	54.50	4	1	3	0	\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	0
\$88	88.00	0	5	1	4	1	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
\$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	1	\$112	102.50	9.50	5	0	5	5
\$80	80.00	0	9	1	8	5	\$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2
\$156	100.00	56.00	4	1	3	0	\$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2
\$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	0	\$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	2
\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	2	\$96	64.50	31.50	3	1	2	2
\$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
\$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	1	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	3	\$258	167.50	90.50	7	2	5	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$91	91.00	0	5	1	4	4
\$161	143.50	17.50	7	1	6	0	\$79	79.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$81	51.50	29.50	2	1	1	1	\$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	0	3	3	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	6	\$100	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	2	\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	0
\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0	\$195	125.00	70.00	5	0	5	0
\$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
\$180	180.00	0	10	2	8	0	\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	2
\$110	82.00	28.00	4	1	3	3	\$123	83.50	39.50	4	2	2	0
\$93	93.00	0	6	1	5	1	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2
\$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	4	\$59	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	0
\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	\$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	2
\$150	123.00	27.00	6	1	5	3	\$110	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	2
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$110	110.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
\$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	1	\$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	0
\$318	225.50	92.50	11	2	9	0	\$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	4
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	1
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$78	50.00	28.00	2	0	2	2
\$98	65.50	32.50	3	1	2	2	\$150	91.50	58.50	3	1	2	2
\$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	2	0	\$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	0
\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	0	\$206	184.50	21.50	9	1	8	7
\$192	143.50	48.50	7	1	6	6	\$176	143.50	32.50	7	1	6	0
\$209	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	\$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$105	105.00	0	7	1	6	4
\$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	0	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	9
\$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	4	\$129	123.00	6.00	6	1	5	3
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$89	89.00	0	7	1	6	3
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	3
\$129	75.50	53.50	2	1	1	0	\$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	2
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	0	3	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$122	77.50	44.50	3	1	2	0
\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	3	\$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	3
\$231	154.00	77.00	7	2	5	1	\$122	102.50	19.50	5	1	4	4
\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
\$160	143.50	16.50	7	1	6	6	\$212	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	6
\$157	100.50	56.50	4	2	2	1	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$39	20.50	14.00	1	0	1	1	\$325	225.50	99.50	11	1	10	6
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$304	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$242	165.00	77.00	8	1	7	0
\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	0	\$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	0
\$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$214	140.00	74.00	6	2	4	0	\$131	76.50	54.50	2	1	1	0
\$84	53.00	31.00	2	0	2	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$185	125.50	59.50	6	1	5	0	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	5
\$121	121.00	0	10	2	8	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	4	\$96	38.50	27.50	1	0	1	1
\$235	155.00	79.00	7	1	6	0	\$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$286	192.50	93.50	9	2	7	0
\$130	130.00	0	7	1	6	6	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$281	190.00	91.00	9	1	8	0	\$203	134.50	68.00	6	1	5	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$91	56.50	34.50	2	1	1	0	\$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	0
\$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	6	\$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1	\$270	179.00	91.00	8	2	6	0
\$203	184.50	18.50	9	1	8	0	\$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
\$140	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	0	\$47	47.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	3	\$93	57.50	35.50	2	0	2	2
\$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$257	184.50	72.50	9	1	8	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1	\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1	\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	4
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	1	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$183	164.00	19.00	8	1	7	7	\$231	184.50	46.50	9	1	8	2
\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	1	\$92	57.00	35.00	2	0	2	2

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$125	\$102.50	\$22.50	5	1	4	2	\$147	\$102.50	\$44.50	5	1	4	0
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	0	\$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	0
\$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	3	\$40	40.00	0	4	1	3	1
\$140	92.00	48.00	4	1	3	3	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	0	\$104	82.00	22.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	0	\$162	123.00	39.00	6	1	5	3
\$90	60.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	3	\$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	3
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$115	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	2
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$235	164.00	71.00	8	1	7	7
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	0	\$179	111.50	67.50	4	2	2	0
\$176	176.00	0	11	2	9	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	0	\$167	164.00	3.00	8	1	7	4
\$96	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	0	\$142	142.00	0	7	1	6	3
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	4
\$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	\$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$253	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	0
\$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	1	\$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	2
\$298	198.50	99.50	9	2	7	0	\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2	\$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	2
\$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1	\$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	0
\$45	45.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$98	60.00	38.00	2	1	1	1	\$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	2
\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	1	\$358	246.00	112.00	12	2	10	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0
\$123	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2	\$321	215.50	105.50	10	1	9	1
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
\$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3	\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5
\$72	72.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$97	97.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$135	89.50	45.50	4	1	3	2
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1	\$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	0
\$133	133.00	0	10	1	9	9	\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	4
\$182	113.60	68.50	5	1	4	4	\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	0
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1	\$264	159.50	104.50	5	1	4	0
\$192	112.50	79.50	3	1	2	0	\$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0	\$80	51.00	29.00	2	0	2	0
\$208	143.50	64.50	7	1	6	6	\$124	73.00	51.00	2	1	1	1
\$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1	\$87	87.00	0	5	1	4	4
\$256	184.50	71.50	9	1	8	1	\$266	184.50	81.50	9	1	8	1
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	0
\$92	82.00	10.00	4	1	3	3	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
\$253	173.00	85.00	8	2	6	0	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	7	\$63	47.50	15.50	2	0	2	2
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$142	102.50	39.50	5	1	4	4	\$56	41.00	15.00	2	1	1	1
\$305	207.50	97.50	10	1	9	9	\$200	143.50	66.50	7	1	6	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$55	41.00	14.00	2	1	1	0
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
\$228	184.50	43.50	9	1	8	0	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	4
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$222	205.00	17.00	10	1	9	4
\$117	117.00	0	6	1	5	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$79	50.50	28.50	2	1	1	1	\$328	219.00	109.00	10	2	8	0
\$111	111.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$54	54.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$128	128.00	0	8	1	7	5	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	4	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	2	\$168	123.00	35.00	6	1	5	1
\$232	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	6	\$65	65.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0	\$91	62.00	29.00	3	1	2	2
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1	\$132	123.00	9.00	6	1	5	2
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	4
\$129	123.00	6.00	6	1	5	0	\$83	52.50	30.50	2	0	2	2
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$274	186.50	87.50	9	2	7	0
\$127	127.00	0	7	1	6	1	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	6
\$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	3	\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2
\$232	184.50	47.50	9	1	8	8	\$54	54.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$186	143.50	42.50	7	1	6	6	\$74	74.00	0	7	1	6	1
\$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0	\$174	103.50	70.50	3	1	2	2
\$225	151.00	74.00	7	1	6	0	\$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	3
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	5	\$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	4
\$272	185.50	86.50	9	1	8	0	\$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	3
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5	\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	1
\$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	3	\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
\$183	143.50	39.50	7	1	6	1	\$50	41.00	9.00	2	1	1	0
\$236	184.50	51.50	9	1	8	8	\$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2
\$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2	\$187	137.00	0	7	1	6	3
\$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	6	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	0	\$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	1
\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	6	\$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1
\$155	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	3	\$132	82.50	49.50	3	2	1	1
\$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	4
\$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	2	\$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	1
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$153	104.00	49.00	5	1	4	0	\$87	54.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	1	\$123	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$140	123.00	17.00	6	1	5	1
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0	\$181	143.50	37.50	7	1	6	1
\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3							

Receiving assistance for 2 years, but less than 3 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$148.....	\$96.00	\$52.00	4	1	3	3	\$130.....	\$87.00	\$43.00	4	1	3	3
\$141.....	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$154.....	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$85.....	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	0
\$197.....	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$100.....	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	2
\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	\$203.....	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0
\$157.....	100.50	56.50	4	0	4	0	\$160.....	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$257.....	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	0	\$199.....	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	5
\$90.....	90.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$235.....	176.00	59.00	7	1	6	0
\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$75.....	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2
\$53.....	53.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$239.....	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	0
\$141.....	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0	\$188.....	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	4
\$154.....	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	\$259.....	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7
\$94.....	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	1	\$122.....	83.00	39.00	4	0	3	3
\$61.....	61.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$112.....	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	2
\$303.....	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	0	\$151.....	97.50	53.50	4	1	3	3
\$148.....	102.50	45.50	5	1	4	0	\$159.....	96.00	63.00	3	1	2	2
\$112.....	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1	\$273.....	205.00	68.00	10	1	9	2
\$75.....	61.50	13.50	3	0	3	0	\$111.....	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$229.....	147.50	81.50	6	2	4	0	\$203.....	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
\$115.....	102.50	12.50	5	1	4	0	\$230.....	164.00	66.00	8	1	7	7
\$193.....	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4	\$188.....	143.50	44.50	7	1	6	6
\$107.....	102.50	4.50	5	1	4	0	\$165.....	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
\$177.....	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	5	\$184.....	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
\$203.....	123.50	79.50	4	1	3	0	\$227.....	164.00	63.00	8	1	7	3
\$108.....	102.50	5.50	5	1	4	2	\$154.....	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$237.....	164.00	73.00	8	1	7	2	\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$123.....	78.00	45.00	3	1	2	2	\$142.....	102.50	39.50	5	1	4	4
\$247.....	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0	\$113.....	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	1
\$214.....	134.50	79.50	5	1	4	0	\$111.....	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2
\$209.....	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0	\$374.....	266.50	107.50	13	2	11	1
\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$88.....	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	1
\$93.....	93.00	0	6	1	5	1	\$85.....	85.00	0	6	1	5	5
\$162.....	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4	\$117.....	102.50	14.05	5	1	4	0
\$292.....	190.00	102.00	8	2	6	0	\$81.....	81.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$227.....	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$191.....	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5
\$150.....	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	1	\$128.....	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
\$229.....	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	3	\$143.....	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
\$191.....	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$119.....	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	0
\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	\$184.....	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
\$156.....	94.50	61.50	3	0	3	0							

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$62.....	\$62.00	0	5	1	4	2	\$175.....	\$123.00	\$52.00	6	1	5	0
\$101.....	82.00	\$19.00	4	1	3	3	\$141.....	141.00	0	8	1	7	2
\$62.....	61.50	50.50	3	2	1	1	\$233.....	205.00	28.00	10	2	8	0
\$564.....	326.00	238.00	8	2	6	0	\$177.....	99.50	77.50	2	1	1	0
\$323.....	200.00	123.00	7	1	6	1	\$44.....	44.00	0	3	1	2	2
\$150.....	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0	\$134.....	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	1
\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$160.....	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$241.....	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	6	\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$267.....	184.05	82.50	9	1	8	4	\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
\$38.....	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0	\$134.....	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2	\$334.....	266.50	67.50	13	1	12	2
\$155.....	105.00	50.00	5	1	4	0	\$38.....	38.00	0	8	1	7	5
\$114.....	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	\$215.....	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$154.....	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$135.....	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	4
\$111.....	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$228.....	164.00	64.00	8	1	7	0
\$102.....	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0	\$130.....	102.50	27.50	5	1	4	2
\$157.....	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	2	\$209.....	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$152.....	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0	\$138.....	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	3
\$112.....	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1	\$123.....	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	4
\$105.....	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	0	\$215.....	146.00	69.00	7	1	6	0
\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$218.....	164.00	54.00	8	1	7	3
\$170.....	107.00	63.00	4	1	3	3	\$173.....	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	1
\$140.....	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4	\$200.....	184.50	15.50	9	1	8	6
\$144.....	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	2	\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$210.....	164.00	46.00	8	2	6	6	\$166.....	164.00	2.00	8	1	7	3
\$94.....	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2	\$138.....	85.50	52.50	3	0	3	3
\$33.....	33.00	0	3	2	1	1	\$116.....	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	4
\$197.....	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$118.....	102.50	15.50	5	1	4	1
\$68.....	68.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$102.....	62.00	40.00	2	1	1	1
\$87.....	61.50	25.50	3	1	2	2	\$130.....	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3
\$165.....	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0	\$154.....	88.00	66.00	2	1	1	1
\$126.....	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	1	\$191.....	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$138.....	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
\$186.....	109.50	76.50	3	1	2	2	\$113.....	78.50	34.50	4	1	3	3
\$215.....	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$146.....	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
\$135.....	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	3	\$110.....	71.50	38.50	3	0	3	3
\$137.....	90.50	46.50	4	1	3	0	\$237.....	151.50	85.50	6	2	4	4
\$72.....	41.50	30.50	1	0	1	0	\$97.....	97.00	0	5	2	3	0
\$59.....	35.00	24.00	1	0	1	0	\$277.....	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0
\$148.....	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1	\$162.....	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	1
\$223.....	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	5	\$197.....	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	1
\$148.....	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$270.....	179.00	91.00	8	1	7	0
\$163.....	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5	\$174.....	143.50	30.50	7	2	5	0

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$31	\$21.00	\$10.00	1	0	1	1	\$62	\$36.50	\$25.50	1	0	1	1
\$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	0	\$176	164.00	12.00	8	1	7	1
\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0	\$169	107.00	52.00	5	1	4	4
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	0
\$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4	\$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4
\$91	56.50	34.50	2	0	2	2	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	2
\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$189	143.50	45.50	7	2	5	0
\$43	41.00	2.00	2	1	1	0	\$119	102.50	16.50	5	0	5	0
\$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0	\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	1
\$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	2	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	0	\$219	142.50	76.50	6	1	5	0
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	\$40	40.00	0	2	1	1	1
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3	\$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	1
\$115	74.00	41.00	3	1	2	2	\$121	77.00	44.00	3	0	3	1
\$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	4	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	0	2	0	\$97	97.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	4	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
\$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
\$290	225.50	64.50	11	2	9	0	\$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
\$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	2	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	2	\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
\$140	123.00	17.00	6	1	5	0	\$191	123.00	68.00	5	1	4	1
\$56	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	1	\$120	102.50	17.50	5	1	4	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	1	1	3	0	\$301	225.00	76.00	11	1	10	10
\$315	162.50	152.50	10	1	9	1	\$95	95.00	0	6	1	5	2
\$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	1	\$133	102.50	30.50	5	1	4	0
\$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	1
\$70	40.50	29.50	1	0	1	0	\$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0
\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0	\$286	192.50	93.50	9	2	7	0
\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	3	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3
\$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	1	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	2	1	1
\$219	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	3	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	1
\$281	190.00	91.00	9	1	8	8	\$52	52.00	0	8	2	6	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	0
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$140	140.00	0	8	1	7	7
\$102	102.00	0	5	2	3	0	\$56	56.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$149	123.00	26.00	6	1	5	1	\$41	41.00	0	6	2	4	0
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	\$109	65.50	43.50	2	0	2	2
\$129	86.50	42.50	4	1	3	0	\$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	1
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$168	143.50	24.50	7	1	6	3
\$71	61.50	9.50	3	1	2	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	\$225	151.00	74.00	4	1	3	0
\$41	41.00	0	2	1	1	1	\$72	47.00	25.00	2	1	1	1
\$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	0	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	4
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
\$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	4	\$205	135.50	69.50	6	1	5	2
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	4	\$85	53.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	2
\$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	0	\$173	143.50	29.50	7	1	6	3
\$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	4	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$263	170.00	93.00	7	1	6	2	\$186	126.00	60.00	6	1	5	0
\$221	149.00	72.00	7	1	6	0	\$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	2
\$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	5	\$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	5
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$212	139.00	73.00	6	1	5	3
\$141	141.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$199	132.50	66.50	6	2	4	1
\$128	123.00	5.00	6	0	6	4	\$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	2
\$81	81.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$223	144.50	78.50	6	2	4	4
\$133	83.00	50.00	3	0	3	3	\$190	104.00	26.00	8	1	7	1
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	0
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	0
\$222	149.50	72.50	7	1	6	6	\$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4
\$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	4	\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	4
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	0	\$116	102.50	13.50	5	1	4	3
\$144	88.50	55.50	3	2	1	0	\$15	15.00	0	2	1	1	0
\$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	2	\$105	102.50	2.50	3	1	2	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$310	204.50	105.50	9	2	7	0
\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	1	\$63	42.50	20.50	3	1	2	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$202	143.50	58.50	7	1	6	0
\$242	154.00	88.00	6	0	6	1	\$145	143.50	1.50	7	1	6	0
\$122	122.00	0	7	1	6	1	\$161	102.50	58.50	4	1	3	0
\$215	164.00	51.00	8	1	7	0	\$179	143.50	35.50	7	1	6	5
\$263	175.50	87.50	8	1	7	0	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$101	61.50	39.50	2	1	1	1	\$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	3
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	0
\$108	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	0	\$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	0
\$159	101.50	57.50	4	1	3	1	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$154	104.50	49.50	5	1	4	4	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$161	108.00	53.00	5	1	4	4
\$285	192.00	93.00	9	1	8	0	\$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	0
\$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0	\$174	143.50	30.50	7	1	6	0
\$352	249.00	106.00	12	2	10	0	\$303	206.50	96.50	10	1	9	0
\$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3	\$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	6

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$171	\$113.00	\$58.00	5	0	5	5	\$182	\$124.00	\$58.00	6	1	5	0
\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	\$74	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	0
\$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	1	\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	0
\$115	68.50	46.50	2	1	1	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$173	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	2	\$156	123.00	33.00	6	1	5	1
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	4
\$123	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	0	\$99	60.50	38.50	2	0	2	1
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$226	129.50	96.50	3	1	2	2
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$173	123.00	50.00	6	1	5	5
\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4	\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	3
\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4	\$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2	\$182	113.00	69.00	4	1	3	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$228	152.50	75.50	7	2	5	1
\$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	0	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$112	72.50	39.50	3	1	2	1	\$155	99.50	55.50	4	2	2	0
\$135	123.00	12.00	6	1	5	0	\$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	5
\$251	184.50	66.50	9	1	8	1	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	1	\$156	143.50	12.50	7	1	6	3
\$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	1	\$208	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	2
\$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	1	\$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	2
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	\$154	143.50	10.50	7	1	6	6
\$121	102.50	18.50	5	1	4	4	\$113	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	4
\$285	192.50	92.50	9	1	8	2	\$270	179.00	91.00	8	2	6	0
\$146	102.50	43.50	5	2	3	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$121	71.50	49.50	2	0	2	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$146	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3	\$195	164.00	31.00	8	1	7	2
\$112	72.50	39.50	3	0	3	0	\$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	5
\$86	61.50	24.50	3	0	3	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$236	164.00	72.00	8	1	7	7	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$129	75.50	53.50	2	1	1	0
\$231	164.00	67.00	8	1	7	7	\$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0	\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	2
\$106	64.00	42.00	2	0	2	0	\$160	160.00	0	8	1	7	7
\$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	1	\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	2	\$234	155.50	78.50	7	2	5	0
\$134	102.50	31.50	5	1	4	4	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$214	134.50	79.50	5	2	3	0
\$133	88.50	44.50	4	1	3	3	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$261	184.50	76.50	9	1	8	0	\$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	2
\$134	134.00	0	11	1	10	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	4	\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	0
\$153	98.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	2
\$291	195.00	96.00	9	1	8	0	\$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	1
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	2	\$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$172	143.50	28.50	7	1	6	2
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	5	\$127	123.00	4.00	6	1	5	2
\$152	123.00	29.00	6	1	5	2	\$221	149.00	72.00	7	1	6	1
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	2	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$103	103.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	2	1	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$286	192.50	93.50	9	1	8	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	1
\$119	70.50	48.50	2	1	1	0	\$127	74.50	52.50	2	1	1	1
\$49	41.00	8.00	2	1	1	1	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
\$263	170.50	82.50	8	1	7	1	\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1
\$149	143.50	5.50	7	1	6	0	\$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	6
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$137	123.00	14.00	6	1	5	1
\$313	225.00	87.50	11	2	9	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$85	53.50	31.50	2	0	2	1
\$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$93	82.00	11.00	4	1	3	3
\$75	75.00	0	8	1	7	0	\$74	74.00	0	5	1	4	4
\$167	167.00	0	11	2	9	0	\$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$224	164.00	60.00	8	1	7	0
\$125	74.50	50.50	4	1	3	0	\$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	0
\$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	3	\$279	189.00	90.00	9	1	8	0
\$81	81.00	0	8	1	7	2	\$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	2
\$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0	\$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	8
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
\$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	0	\$158	106.50	51.50	5	1	4	0
\$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2	\$205	143.50	61.50	7	1	6	6
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$174	114.50	59.50	5	1	4	2
\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	4	\$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6
\$143	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	1	\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	0
\$53	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	0	\$99	66.00	33.00	3	0	3	0
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	\$55	33.00	22.00	1	0	1	0
\$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	2	\$282	190.50	91.50	9	1	8	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0	\$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	2
\$125	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	0	\$275	181.59	93.59	8	1	7	0
\$204	164.00	40.00	8	1	7	1	\$244	160.50	83.50	7	1	6	0
\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$206	136.00	70.00	6	1	5	0
\$123	123.00	0	6	1	5	2	\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2	\$121	82.50	38.50	4	1	3	2
\$120	120.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$141	123.00	18.00	6	1	5	5
\$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	0	\$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	0
\$61	36.00	25.00	1	0	1	1	\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$226	164.00	62.00	8	1	7	7
\$193	143.50	49.50	7	1	6	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	6
\$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	0	\$171	112.50	58.50	5	1	4	3
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	1

Receiving assistance for 3 years, but less than 4 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$273	\$246.00	\$27.00	12	2	10	7	\$164	\$98.50	\$65.50	3	1	2	2
\$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	2	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
\$62	61.50	5.50	3	1	2	2	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4	\$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	2
\$101	67.00	34.00	2	0	2	0	\$147	102.50	44.50	5	1	4	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2	\$168	111.50	56.60	5	1	4	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	3	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	0	3	3
\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0
\$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	2	\$137	123.00	14.00	6	1	5	5
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0	\$98	55.00	33.00	2	0	2	2
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$93	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	0
\$202	128.50	73.50	5	2	3	0	\$246	167.00	79.00	8	2	6	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$132	88.00	44.00	4	2	2	2	\$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0
\$75	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2	\$125	84.50	40.50	4	1	3	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1
\$244	138.50	105.50	3	3	0	0	\$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	0
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	1	\$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	3
\$228	228.00	0	12	2	10	0	\$308	209.00	99.00	10	2	8	0
\$79	50.50	28.50	2	0	2	2	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$85	85.00	0	7	1	6	2	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$189	143.50	45.50	7	1	6	3	\$124	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	2
\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	\$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	5
\$155	94.00	61.00	3	0	3	1	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	2	\$122	102.50	19.50	5	1	4	4
\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	2	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$155	105.00	50.00	5	0	5	5	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0
\$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	1	\$91	56.60	34.50	2	1	1	1
\$163	103.50	59.50	4	1	3	0							

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$208	\$137.00	\$71.00	6	1	4	0	\$121	\$77.50	\$43.50	4	1	3	0
\$171	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0	\$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	2
\$169	123.00	46.00	6	1	5	3	\$27	27.00	0	6	1	4	0
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$54	41.00	13.00	2	1	2	0
\$49	30.00	19.00	1	0	1	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$147	147.00	0	10	1	9	0	\$188	121.50	66.50	5	1	4	0
\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0	\$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	0
\$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0	\$90	61.50	38.50	3	0	3	0
\$94	82.00	12.00	4	1	3	1	\$197	143.50	53.50	7	1	6	3
\$48	29.50	18.50	1	0	1	1	\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4
\$243	160.00	83.00	7	1	6	0	\$124	102.50	21.50	5	1	4	1
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$101	61.50	39.50	2	1	1	1
\$207	164.00	43.00	8	1	7	3	\$155	94.00	61.00	3	1	2	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0	\$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2	\$39	39.00	0	6	1	5	1
\$80	80.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
\$113	113.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$169	106.50	62.50	4	0	4	3
\$136	123.00	13.00	6	1	5	3	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$74	48.00	26.00	2	0	2	0	\$105	82.00	23.00	4	1	3	3
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$248	184.50	63.50	9	1	8	8
\$216	146.50	69.50	7	1	6	0	\$115	68.50	46.50	2	1	1	0
\$172	123.00	49.00	7	1	6	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$111	111.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$62	62.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3	\$156	156.00	0	10	1	9	6
\$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	1	\$78	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0
\$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	2	\$95	58.50	36.50	2	0	2	0
\$139	123.00	16.00	6	1	5	1	\$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	2
\$179	179.00	0	9	1	8	4	\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0
\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	3	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$55	55.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$87	82.00	5.00	4	1	3	1
\$294	225.50	68.50	11	1	10	0	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$127	85.50	41.50	4	1	3	3	\$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	0
\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
\$133	123.00	10.00	6	1	5	4	\$283	180.00	103.00	7	1	6	0
\$79	79.00	0	5	1	4	0	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	6
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0	\$257	161.50	95.50	6	2	4	0
\$315	212.50	102.50	10	1	9	0	\$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	\$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3
\$202	128.50	73.50	5	1	4	0	\$51	31.00	20.00	1	0	1	1
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	1	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	2	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$98	98.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	0	\$195	143.50	51.50	7	1	6	2
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	\$269	184.50	84.50	9	2	7	0
\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	0	\$234	155.50	78.50	7	1	6	0
\$239	164.00	76.00	8	1	7	0	\$128	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0
\$150	143.50	6.50	7	2	5	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$141	92.50	48.50	4	1	3	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$87	\$61.50	\$25.50	3	0	3	0	\$127	\$80.00	\$47.00	3	0	3	3
\$126	102.50	23.50	5	1	4	0	\$220	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$218	184.50	33.50	9	1	8	8
\$103	102.50	.50	5	1	4	0	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	3
\$51	41.00	10.00	2	1	1	1	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$150	123.00	27.00	6	1	5	5
\$153	98.50	54.50	4	2	2	0	\$161	97.00	64.00	3	0	3	0
\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	1
\$51	41.00	10.00	2	0	2	2	\$57	41.00	16.00	2	1	1	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$140	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
\$331	226.00	105.00	11	1	10	9	\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
\$82	82.00	0	4	1	3	3	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0	\$117	69.50	47.50	2	0	2	0
\$128	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4	\$211	184.50	26.50	9	1	8	0
\$213	184.50	28.50	9	2	7	5	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$210	143.50	66.50	7	1	6	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	1
\$67	67.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3	\$158	143.50	14.70	7	1	6	2
\$68	68.00	0	4	1	3	2	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	1
\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0	\$76	76.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	0	\$61	41.50	19.50	2	0	2	0
\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	7	\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	0
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	1
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	0	\$160	95.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$116	116.00	0	9	1	8	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	0
\$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2	\$151	92.00	59.00	3	1	2	2
\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	1	\$139	91.50	47.50	4	1	3	3
\$289	194.00	95.00	9	2	7	0	\$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	4
\$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
\$269	184.50	84.50	9	1	8	0	\$231	154.00	77.00	7	2	5	0
\$157	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	2	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
\$258	167.50	90.50	7	1	6	0	\$288	171.50	116.50	5	1	4	4
\$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0
\$64	64.00	0	4	1	3	1	\$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	6
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$207	143.50	63.50	7	1	6	1
\$184	143.50	40.50	7	1	6	6	\$187	187.00	0	11	1	10	1
\$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0	\$139	102.50	36.50	5	1	4	2
\$183	124.50	58.50	4	1	3	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2	\$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0
\$47	47.00	15.00	1	0	1	1	\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	2
\$220	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3	\$64	64.00	0	4	1	3	2
\$157	157.00	0	10	1	9	9	\$154	104.50	49.50	4	1	3	3
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6	\$282	185.00	97.00	8	2	6	0
\$209	132.00	77.00	5	1	4	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$139	89.00	53.00	3	0	3	1	\$101	101.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$239	158.00	81.00	7	2	5	0	\$173	108.50	64.50	4	1	3	3
\$58	40.00	18.00	2	0	2	0	\$234	164.00	70.00	8	1	7	7
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	\$188	184.50	3.50	9	2	7	0
\$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	0	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	3	\$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	1
\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	0	\$214	134.50	79.50	5	1	4	1
\$131	123.00	8.00	6	1	5	5	\$180	117.50	62.50	5	1	4	2
\$253	225.50	27.50	11	1	10	10	\$199	132.50	66.50	6	1	5	2
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	\$159	123.00	36.00	6	1	5	5
\$200	143.50	56.50	7	0	7	3	\$88	55.00	33.00	2	0	2	2
\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	1
\$60	60.00	0	3	1	2	2	\$45	41.00	4.00	2	1	1	0
\$105	105.00	0	7	1	6	1	\$108	65.00	43.00	2	1	1	0
\$219	156.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$112	82.00	30.00	4	1	3	3
\$113	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	3	\$272	163.50	108.50	5	1	4	0
\$207	164.00	43.00	8	1	7	6	\$98	98.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0	\$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	4
\$185	143.50	41.50	7	1	6	2	\$287	193.00	94.00	9	1	8	5
\$131	82.00	49.00	3	1	2	2	\$334	205.50	128.50	7	2	5	0
\$118	118.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$74	42.50	31.50	1	0	1	1
\$42	41.00	1	2	1	1	1	\$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$165	123.00	42.00	6	1	5	0
\$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	4	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4
\$07	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	\$187	121.00	66.50	5	1	4	0
\$268	172.50	95.50	7	2	5	5	\$113	73.00	40.00	3	1	2	2
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1	\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4
\$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$81	51.50	29.50	2	0	2	2	\$235	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6
\$175	123.00	62.00	6	1	5	5	\$87	87.00	0	7	1	6	2
\$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2	\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
\$84	84.00	0	7	2	5	0	\$172	113.50	58.50	5	1	4	4
\$243	165.50	77.50	8	1	7	4	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
\$114	82.00	32.00	4	1	3	3	\$103	68.00	35.00	3	0	3	3
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$44	41.00	3.00	2	0	2	2
\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4	\$251	205.00	46.00	10	1	9	2
\$80	51.00	29.00	2	1	1	0	\$71	71.00	0	4	0	4	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	4
\$260	205.00	55.00	10	1	9	9	\$69	61.50	7.50	3	1	2	0
\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	1	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1
\$155	94.00	61.00	3	2	1	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1	\$173	114.00	59.00	5	1	4	3
\$68	45.00	23.00	2	0	2	1	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$96	96.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$108	70.50	37.50	3	1	2	0	\$155	123.00	32.00	6	1	5	4
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$54	54.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$144	123.00	21.00	6	1	5	5	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0

Receiving assistance for 4 years, but less than 5 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$79	\$50.50	\$28.50	2	1	1	1	\$240	\$158.00	\$81.50	7	2	5	0
\$149	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	0	\$156	105.50	60.50	5	1	4	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	0
\$67	44.50	22.50	2	1	1	0	\$85	48.00	37.00	1	0	1	3
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$170	112.50	57.50	5	1	4	4
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6	\$216	146.50	69.50	7	1	6	1
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	0	4	0	\$93	68.50	24.50	4	1	3	2
\$111	102.50	8.50	5	1	4	4	\$133	123.00	10.00	6	1	5	1
\$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	1	\$187	164.00	23.00	8	1	7	0
\$176	123.00	53.00	6	1	5	5	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	1	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$321	215.50	105.50	10	1	9	0
\$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	6	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$117	102.50	14.50	5	1	4	4	\$152	103.50	48.50	5	1	4	0
\$132	82.50	49.50	3	1	2	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	1	\$99	99.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
\$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	0	\$150	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$208	143.50	64.50	7	1	6	5
\$220	148.50	71.50	7	1	6	1	\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	4
\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0	\$64	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	1
\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3	\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	0
\$183	124.50	58.50	6	1	5	5	\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$96	59.00	37.00	2	0	2	0
\$80	61.50	18.50	3	1	2	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$94	63.50	30.50	3	1	2	0	\$197	126.00	71.00	5	1	4	0
\$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2	\$106	102.50	3.50	5	1	4	0
\$169	112.00	57.00	5	1	4	4	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	3
\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	2	\$180	164.00	16.00	8	1	7	4
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	\$156	94.50	61.50	3	2	1	0
\$143	88.00	55.00	3	1	2	1	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4	\$180	123.00	57.00	6	1	5	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$211	144.00	67.00	7	1	6	0
\$218	147.50	70.50	7	1	6	1	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	2
\$250	163.50	86.50	7	1	6	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	0	2	2	\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0
\$169	106.50	62.50	4	1	3	2	\$86	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2	\$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1	\$75	75.00	0	7	1	6	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$58	34.50	23.50	1	0	1	1
\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	0	\$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0
\$257	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	6	\$171	143.50	27.50	7	1	6	1
\$109	71.00	38.00	3	1	2	0	\$147	123.00	24.00	6	1	5	0
\$151	103.00	48.00	5	1	4	4	\$85	61.50	23.50	3	1	2	2
\$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	0	\$64	43.00	21.00	2	1	1	1
\$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	2	\$138	123.00	15.00	6	1	5	5
\$309	209.50	99.50	10	1	9	8	\$233	164.00	69.00	8	1	7	0
\$198	143.50	54.50	7	1	6	0	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$124	102.50	21.50	5	0	5	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	1	\$56	33.50	22.50	1	0	1	0
\$211	144.00	67.00	7	2	5	4	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4	\$74	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	0
\$158	101.00	57.00	4	1	3	3	\$219	164.00	55.00	8	1	7	0
\$145	89.00	56.00	3	1	2	0							

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$114-----	\$68.00	\$46.00	2	1	1	1	\$232-----	\$184.50	\$47.50	9	1	8	0
\$145-----	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0	\$159-----	107.00	52.00	5	0	5	2
\$267-----	184.50	82.50	9	1	8	2	\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$79-----	45.00	34.00	1	0	1	0	\$166-----	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$72-----	52.50	19.50	3	0	3	0	\$114-----	82.00	32.00	4	0	4	4
\$259-----	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7	\$74-----	48.00	26.00	2	1	1	1
\$332-----	221.00	111.00	10	2	8	0	\$247-----	184.50	62.50	9	1	8	0
\$64-----	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	0	\$304-----	201.50	102.50	9	2	7	0
\$152-----	102.50	49.50	5	1	4	1	\$181-----	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	1
\$145-----	94.00	51.00	3	0	3	2	\$205-----	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
\$194-----	124.50	69.50	5	0	5	5	\$113-----	102.50	10.50	5	1	4	4
\$148-----	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	0	\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$207-----	136.50	70.50	6	1	5	1	\$113-----	82.00	31.00	4	1	3	3
\$245-----	161.00	84.00	7	1	6	0	\$195-----	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	0
\$187-----	120.50	66.50	5	1	4	0	\$130-----	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2
\$75-----	48.50	26.50	2	0	2	2	\$258-----	167.50	90.50	7	2	5	0
\$155-----	99.50	55.50	4	1	3	1	\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$140-----	86.50	53.50	3	1	2	2	\$215-----	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	3
\$141-----	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$136-----	90.00	48.00	4	1	3	3
\$133-----	77.50	55.50	2	1	1	1	\$187-----	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$24-----	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1	\$193-----	134.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$92-----	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1	\$141-----	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	4
\$171-----	113.00	58.00	5	0	5	0	\$171-----	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	3
\$263-----	205.00	58.00	10	1	9	9	\$82-----	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0
\$174-----	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	1	\$163-----	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5
\$34-----	22.50	11.50	1	0	1	0	\$209-----	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$64	\$43.00	\$21.00	2	0	2	2	\$150	\$97.00	\$53.00	4	0	4	0
\$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1	\$114	73.50	40.50	3	0	3	0
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0	\$331	226.00	105.00	11	1	10	0
\$180	143.50	36.50	7	1	6	6	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	8	\$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	1
\$269	178.50	90.50	8	1	7	0	\$262	184.50	77.50	9	1	8	2
\$179	123.00	56.00	6	1	5	5	\$160	162.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	1	\$127	102.50	24.50	5	1	4	0
\$137	90.50	46.50	4	0	4	0	\$139	139.00	0	8	1	7	0
\$200	184.50	15.50	9	2	7	2	\$327	218.50	108.50	10	1	9	2
\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2	\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	1
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4
\$320	209.50	110.50	9	1	8	0	\$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	3	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
\$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	5	\$304	225.50	78.50	11	1	10	5
\$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	0	\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
\$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0	\$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4
\$182	118.50	63.50	5	1	4	0	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	1
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$296	197.50	98.50	9	1	8	1	\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	0
\$98	57.50	35.50	2	1	1	1	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	5	\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0
\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3	\$165	110.00	55.00	5	1	4	4
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5	\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	0
\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
\$271	179.50	91.50	8	1	7	7	\$256	205.00	51.00	10	1	9	5
\$247	184.50	82.50	9	1	8	4	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$269	205.00	54.00	10	2	8	3	\$193	164.00	29.00	8	2	6	0
\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2	\$213	213.00	0	11	1	10	3
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	3
\$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	0	\$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1
\$247	167.50	79.50	8	1	7	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	1	\$213	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	6
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6	\$157	100.50	56.50	4	1	3	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$112	112.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$276	182.00	94.00	8	2	6	0
\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	2	\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
\$62	62.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$184	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	0
\$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	0	\$111	72.00	39.00	3	1	2	2
\$128	86.00	42.00	4	1	3	3	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$200	133.00	67.00	6	1	5	5	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	0
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$184	119.50	64.50	5	0	5	0	\$35	35.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$94	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2	\$139	86.00	53.00	3	1	2	0
\$242	159.50	82.50	7	1	6	6	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	0	\$144	94.00	50.00	4	1	3	3
\$65	65.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$163	98.00	65.00	3	1	2	2
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$164	143.50	20.50	7	1	6	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
\$214	145.50	68.50	7	1	6	0	\$160	123.00	37.00	6	2	4	0
\$256	166.50	89.50	7	1	6	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$187	126.50	60.50	6	2	4	0	\$166	110.50	55.50	5	1	4	4
\$283	185.50	97.50	8	1	7	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$57	41.00	16.00	2	0	2	2	\$105	69.00	36.00	3	1	2	1
\$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	1	\$288	188.00	100.00	8	2	6	0
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	\$233	155.00	78.00	7	1	6	2
\$160	160.00	0	9	2	7	0	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$85	82.00	3.00	4	1	3	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	1
\$147	90.00	57.00	3	1	2	2	\$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	1
\$178	123.00	55.00	6	1	5	0	\$149	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	1
\$102	102.00	0	6	1	5	5	\$110	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	1
\$165	104.50	60.50	4	0	4	4	\$344	194.00	150.00	4	1	3	0
\$98	60.00	38.00	2	1	1	1	\$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2	\$132	77.00	55.00	2	1	1	1
\$172	123.00	49.00	6	1	5	3	\$124	84.00	40.00	4	1	3	3
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	0	\$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	2
\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0
\$47	29.00	18.00	1	0	1	0	\$279	225.50	53.50	11	1	10	10
\$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	0	\$138	123.00	15.00	6	1	5	5
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1	\$175	143.50	31.50	7	1	6	1
\$96	96.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$229	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	0
\$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	4	\$345	233.00	112.00	11	1	10	0
\$129	88.50	42.50	4	1	3	0	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	\$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	1
\$135	123.00	12.00	6	1	5	4	\$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	1
\$217	147.00	70.00	7	1	6	0	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	1	\$138	96.50	41.50	5	1	4	0
\$73	61.50	11.50	3	1	2	2	\$216	205.00	11.00	10	1	9	2
\$175	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$128	80.50	47.50	3	1	2	2
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	5
\$178	164.00	14.00	8	1	7	1	\$184	125.00	59.00	6	1	5	3
\$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0	\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	0
\$159	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	4	\$124	73.00	51.00	2	0	2	0
\$135	102.50	32.50	5	1	4	0	\$84	61.50	22.50	3	0	3	3
\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	4	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$144	102.50	41.50	5	1	4	4	\$104	63.00	41.00	2	1	1	1
\$206	143.50	62.50	7	1	6	4	\$196	125.50	70.50	5	1	4	4
\$197	164.00	33.00	8	1	7	7	\$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	1
\$237	164.00	74.00	8	1	7	7	\$128	102.50	20.50	5	1	4	0
\$222	184.50	37.50	9	1	8	3	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0	\$228	147.00	81.00	6	1	5	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	0	\$145	102.50	42.50	5	1	4	0
\$174	109.00	65.00	4	1	3	0	\$80	80.00	0	5	1	4	1
\$24	24.00	0	3	1	2	0							

Receiving assistance for 5 years, but less than 6 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$181	\$118.00	\$63.00	5	1	4	0	\$159	\$101.50	\$57.50	4	1	3	1
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$46	28.50	17.50	1	0	1	1
\$101	61.50	39.50	2	0	2	2	\$111	66.50	41.50	2	1	1	1
\$43	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	1	\$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	1
\$204	143.50	60.50	7	1	6	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$125	73.50	61.50	2	1	1	1	\$102	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0
\$211	133.00	78.00	6	1	4	0	\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
\$241	164.50	76.50	8	1	7	1	\$156	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	2
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	1
\$223	150.00	73.00	7	1	6	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$257	172.50	84.50	8	1	7	7	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
\$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	4	\$86	86.00	0	5	1	4	2
\$99	66.00	33.00	3	1	2	0	\$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	1
\$41	26.00	15.00	1	0	1	0	\$228	147.00	81.00	6	0	6	0
\$133	88.50	44.50	4	1	3	0	\$103	68.00	35.00	3	1	2	2
\$226	146.00	80.00	6	2	4	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	2
\$256	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	3	\$160	123.00	37.00	6	1	5	5
\$99	60.50	38.50	1	2	1	1	\$217	141.50	75.50	6	2	4	0
\$113	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	3
\$112	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	0	\$189	127.50	61.50	6	1	5	5
\$200	133.00	67.00	6	1	5	3	\$297	205.00	92.00	10	1	9	3
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	0
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
\$182	124.00	58.00	6	1	5	1	\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	0
\$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	0	\$108	123.00	45.00	6	1	5	2
\$129	81.00	48.00	3	1	2	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0
\$205	143.50	61.50	7	1	6	6	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
\$203	104.50	98.50	6	1	5	5	\$67	39.00	28.00	1	0	1	1
\$26	20.50	5.50	1	0	1	1	\$101	67.00	34.00	3	1	2	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$56	56.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$165	104.50	60.50	4	1	3	3	\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	5
\$75	75.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$148	96.00	52.00	4	1	3	3
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0	\$149	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	0
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0	\$153	143.50	9.50	7	2	5	0
\$119	119.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	0	3	3
\$152	98.00	54.00	4	1	3	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$114	82.00	32.00	4	1	3	1	\$145	89.00	56.00	3	0	3	3
\$75	75.00	0	7	2	5	0	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$89	55.50	33.50	2	1	1	1
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$88	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	2
\$212	164.00	48.00	8	1	7	1	\$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	8
\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	0	\$31	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1
\$66	66.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
\$72	72.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$186	120.50	65.50	5	0	5	0
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	0	\$183	119.00	64.00	5	1	4	4
\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	0	\$116	74.50	41.50	3	0	3	3
\$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	0
\$72	61.50	10.50	7	1	6	2	\$203	143.50	59.50	7	1	6	0
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	2	\$70	46.00	24.00	2	0	2	0
\$104	63.00	41.00	2	0	2	2	\$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	1
\$64	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 6 years, but less than 7 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$170	\$170.00	\$63.00	4	1	3	2	\$303	\$201.00	\$102.00	9	1	8	0
\$217	164.00	53.00	8	1	7	2	\$162	108.50	53.50	5	1	4	4
\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	3	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
\$282	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	5	\$102	82.00	20.00	4	1	3	0
\$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	1	\$200	164.00	36.00	8	1	7	8
\$97	65.00	32.00	3	1	2	2	\$236	184.50	51.50	9	1	8	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	3	\$273	186.00	87.00	9	1	8	0
\$32	32.00	0	5	1	4	4	\$172	123.00	49.00	6	2	4	0
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	5	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	1	\$265	176.50	88.50	8	1	7	1
\$132	82.50	49.50	3	0	3	3	\$122	72.00	50.00	2	1	1	0
\$218	218.00	0	12	2	10	1	\$122	83.00	39.00	4	1	3	3
\$138	102.50	35.50	5	1	4	4	\$222	164.00	58.00	8	1	7	2
\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	2	\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0	\$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
\$259	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	7	\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
\$181	123.50	57.50	6	1	5	4	\$239	158.00	81.00	7	1	6	6
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$166	150.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$191	128.50	62.50	6	1	5	0	\$257	167.00	90.00	7	1	6	6
\$211	184.50	26.50	9	1	8	0	\$157	123.00	34.00	6	1	5	5
\$185	120.00	65.00	5	1	4	2	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5
\$109	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	1	\$243	165.50	77.50	8	2	6	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$126	73.50	61.50	2	1	1	1
\$118	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	0	\$163	88.00	65.00	3	1	2	2
\$155	143.50	11.50	7	1	6	4	\$314	206.50	107.50	9	1	8	0
\$89	55.50	33.50	2	0	2	2	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	1	\$231	148.50	82.50	6	1	5	0
\$203	143.50	59.50	7	1	6	5	\$117	102.50	14.50	5	0	5	1
\$82	52.00	30.00	2	1	1	0	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1

Receiving assistance for 6 years, but less than 7 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$167	\$111.00	\$56.00	5	1	4	2	\$110	\$66.00	\$44.00	2	0	2	2
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6	\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0
\$156	100.00	56.00	5	1	4	2	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	2
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$121	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1
\$141	87.00	54.00	3	1	2	2	\$146	102.50	43.50	5	1	4	4
\$271	185.00	88.00	9	1	8	8	\$240	164.00	76.00	8	1	7	7
\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	1	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$141	141.00	0	7	1	6	1	\$102	67.50	34.50	3	1	2	2
\$116	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	2	\$95	82.00	13.00	4	2	2	2
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4
\$200	164.00	36.00	8	1	7	2	\$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	0
\$206	184.50	21.50	9	1	8	0	\$264	184.50	79.50	9	1	8	0
\$327	287.00	40.00	14	2	12	1	\$289	188.50	100.50	8	1	7	7
\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	0	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	5	\$137	102.50	34.50	5	1	4	4
\$238	164.00	74.00	8	1	7	0	\$163	123.00	40.00	6	1	5	5
\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1	\$259	168.00	91.00	7	1	6	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$113	67.50	45.50	2	1	1	0	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2
\$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	0	\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3
\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0	\$105	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	0
\$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	0	\$309	204.00	105.00	9	2	7	0
\$97	59.50	37.50	2	1	1	1	\$145	94.50	50.50	4	2	2	0
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	\$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	4
\$50	30.00	0	6	1	5	0	\$285	192.00	93.00	9	1	8	0
\$117	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	0	\$148	143.50	4.50	7	1	6	3
\$209	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	3	\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
\$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	3	\$265	184.50	80.50	9	1	8	1
\$102	62.00	40.00	2	0	2	0	\$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0
\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	2	\$217	136.00	81.00	5	1	4	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$131	87.50	43.50	4	1	3	3
\$197	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5	\$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	0
\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	4	\$99	60.50	38.50	2	1	1	0
\$173	114.00	59.00	5	1	4	0	\$209	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	2
\$245	161.00	84.00	7	1	6	4	\$157	95.00	62.00	3	2	1	0
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$130	81.50	48.50	3	1	2	2
\$278	172.00	106.00	6	1	5	1	\$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	2
\$177	123.00	54.00	6	1	5	4	\$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	2
\$190	128.00	62.00	6	1	5	0	\$134	89.00	45.00	4	1	3	3
\$241	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	3	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
\$131	87.50	43.50	4	1	3	3	\$107	64.50	42.50	2	0	2	2
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0	\$234	184.50	49.50	9	1	8	1
\$90	56.00	34.00	2	0	2	2	\$72	61.50	10.50	3	0	3	3
\$149	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	3	\$17	17.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$125	73.50	61.50	2	1	1	0	\$181	118.00	63.00	5	1	4	0
\$114	68.00	46.00	2	1	1	1	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$184	164.00	20.00	8	1	7	0	\$151	123.00	28.00	6	1	5	5
\$152	92.50	59.50	3	1	2	2	\$108	82.00	26.00	4	1	3	2
\$125	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	0	\$251	184.50	66.50	9	1	8	8
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1
\$144	88.50	55.50	3	1	2	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
\$215	140.50	74.50	6	1	5	2	\$121	77.00	44.00	3	1	2	2
\$177	116.00	61.00	5	1	4	0	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
\$185	164.00	21.00	8	1	7	0	\$277	182.50	94.50	8	1	7	2
\$169	112.00	57.00	6	1	5	0	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
\$98	82.00	16.00	4	1	3	0	\$209	164.00	45.00	8	1	7	0
\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0	\$95	88.50	36.50	2	0	2	2
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$82	82.00	30.00	2	1	1	0
\$126	85.00	41.00	4	1	3	0	\$104	102.50	1.50	5	1	4	0
\$100	61.00	39.00	2	1	1	0	\$187	115.50	71.50	4	1	3	3
\$10	10.00	0	2	1	1	0	\$94	94.00	0	6	1	5	0
\$187	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$194	138.50	55.50	5	1	4	0
\$26	26.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$333	221.50	111.50	10	1	9	9
\$95	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	0	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$229	164.00	65.00	8	1	7	1	\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	2
\$71	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	1	\$231	154.00	77.00	7	1	6	0
\$183	124.50	58.50	6	1	5	5	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0
\$124	102.50	21.50	5	0	5	5	\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	2	\$138	138.00	0	7	1	6	6
\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1	\$154	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	3
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2							

Receiving assistance for 7 years, but less than 8 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$178	\$111.00	\$67.00	4	1	3	1	\$172	\$108.00	\$64.00	4	1	3	3
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	\$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	4
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	2
\$195	125.00	70.00	5	0	5	0	\$38	38.00	0	3	1	2	0
\$107	82.00	25.00	4	1	3	3	\$187	126.50	60.50	6	1	5	4
\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$221	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$247	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	0
\$48	48.00	0	4	1	3	1	\$38	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	1
\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0	\$134	83.50	50.50	3	1	2	2
\$66	38.50	27.50	1	0	1	1	\$108	102.50	5.50	5	1	4	7
\$116	82.00	34.00	4	1	3	0	\$136	136.00	0	8	1	7	7
\$92	57.00	35.00	2	1	1	1	\$220	143.00	77.00	6	2	4	1
\$171	123.00	48.00	6	1	5	1	\$129	102.50	26.50	5	1	4	4
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$168	111.50	56.50	5	1	4	4

Receiving assistance for 7 years, but less than 8 years—Continued

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$124.....	\$84.00	\$40.00	4	1	3	1	\$205.....	\$130.00	\$75.00	5	1	4	4
\$57.....	57.00	0	3	1	2	0	\$71.....	46.50	24.50	2	1	1	0
\$164.....	98.50	65.50	3	1	2	0	\$205.....	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1
\$178.....	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$154.....	94.50	59.50	3	1	2	0
\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0	\$63.....	32.00	21.00	1	0	1	1
\$93.....	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	2	\$125.....	123.00	2.00	6	1	5	4
\$128.....	102.50	25.50	5	1	4	0	\$227.....	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5
\$70.....	46.00	24.00	2	1	1	0	\$247.....	162.00	85.00	7	1	6	1
\$86.....	54.00	32.00	2	0	2	1	\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	0	0
\$160.....	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1
\$95.....	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0	\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0
\$179.....	143.50	35.50	7	1	6	0	\$241.....	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	1
\$149.....	102.50	46.50	5	1	4	1	\$42.....	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1
\$160.....	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2	\$254.....	160.00	94.00	6	2	4	0
\$140.....	86.50	53.50	3	0	3	3	\$127.....	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	2
\$193.....	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4	\$197.....	115.00	82.00	3	1	2	1
\$64.....	37.50	26.50	1	0	1	0	\$101.....	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	2
\$227.....	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$215.....	110.50	74.50	6	1	5	1
\$140.....	85.50	53.50	3	1	2	0	\$219.....	148.00	71.00	7	1	6	3
\$195.....	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	2	\$199.....	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$78.....	44.50	33.50	1	0	1	1	\$193.....	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	2
\$213.....	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	0	\$133.....	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	1
\$190.....	122.50	67.50	5	1	4	0	\$12.....	12.00	0	4	0	4	0
\$69.....	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	0	\$197.....	131.50	65.50	6	1	5	5
\$208.....	131.50	76.50	5	2	3	0	\$132.....	132.00	0	7	1	6	2
\$227.....	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	0	\$125.....	79.00	46.00	3	1	2	2
\$110.....	110.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$221.....	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
\$97.....	65.00	32.00	3	0	3	0	\$299.....	199.00	100.00	9	1	8	2
\$72.....	61.50	10.50	3	0	3	0	\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$57.....	48.00	9.00	1	0	1	1	\$280.....	184.00	96.00	8	1	7	1
\$259.....	173.50	85.50	8	1	7	1	\$38.....	24.50	13.50	1	0	1	0
\$235.....	166.00	79.00	7	1	6	1	\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$164.....	109.50	54.50	5	1	4	0	\$162.....	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0
\$209.....	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	5	\$88.....	82.00	6.00	4	1	3	3
\$193.....	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0	\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$98.....	98.00	0	8	1	7	0	\$142.....	123.00	19.00	6	1	5	0
\$90.....	61.50	28.50	3	0	3	1	\$160.....	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	0
\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4	\$88.....	61.50	26.50	3	1	2	0
\$93.....	93.00	0	2	2	3	1	\$125.....	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$111.....	66.50	44.50	4	1	3	1	\$221.....	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	0
\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1	\$58.....	58.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$166.....	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1							

Receiving assistance for 8 years, but less than 9 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$181.....	\$123.50	\$57.50	6	1	5	5	\$109.....	\$102.50	\$6.50	5	1	4	0
\$125.....	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$142.....	87.50	54.50	3	1	2	2
\$160.....	91.50	68.50	3	1	2	2	\$106.....	64.00	42.00	2	1	1	0
\$111.....	66.50	44.50	2	0	2	2	\$209.....	137.50	71.50	6	1	5	0
\$126.....	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0	\$46.....	41.00	5.00	2	1	1	0
\$221.....	143.50	77.50	6	1	5	5	\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$195.....	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	4	\$195.....	125.00	70.00	5	1	4	1
\$178.....	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$160.....	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1
\$287.....	205.00	82.00	10	1	9	1	\$30.....	20.50	9.50	1	0	1	0
\$199.....	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	3	\$89.....	61.50	27.50	3	1	2	2
\$124.....	78.50	45.50	3	1	2	0	\$180.....	117.50	62.50	5	1	4	0
\$199.....	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0	\$229.....	153.00	76.00	7	1	6	2
\$100.....	71.00	29.00	2	1	1	1	\$252.....	170.00	82.00	8	1	7	0
\$235.....	156.00	79.00	7	1	6	6	\$241.....	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	0
\$79.....	45.00	34.00	1	0	1	0	\$150.....	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3
\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	\$125.....	102.50	22.50	5	1	4	1
\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	\$156.....	94.50	61.50	3	1	2	0
\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1	\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$232.....	154.50	77.50	7	1	6	1	\$64.....	43.00	21.00	2	0	2	2
\$138.....	80.00	58.00	2	1	1	0	\$199.....	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$109.....	65.50	43.50	2	1	1	0	\$95.....	58.50	36.50	2	1	1	1
\$106.....	69.50	36.50	3	1	2	0	\$116.....	74.50	41.50	3	1	2	1
\$133.....	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0	\$154.....	94.50	59.50	3	1	2	2
\$31.....	21.00	10.00	1	0	1	1	\$99.....	65.50	33.50	2	0	2	0
\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	1	\$171.....	107.50	63.50	4	1	3	0
\$166.....	123.00	43.00	6	1	5	5	\$137.....	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	2
\$186.....	125.50	60.50	5	1	4	0	\$184.....	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0
\$172.....	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3	\$145.....	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	1
\$110.....	66.00	44.00	2	1	1	0	\$121.....	121.00	0	8	1	7	7
\$160.....	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$205.....	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	0
\$78.....	61.50	16.50	3	1	2	0	\$53.....	41.00	12.00	2	1	1	1
\$264.....	176.00	88.00	8	1	7	1	\$96.....	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1
\$115.....	82.00	33.00	4	1	3	0	\$40.....	40.00	0	4	1	3	3
\$220.....	143.00	77.00	6	1	5	3	\$121.....	71.50	49.50	2	1	1	1
\$135.....	84.00	51.00	3	1	2	0	\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$154.....	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	0	\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$119.....	119.00	0	6	2	4	0	\$187.....	121.00	66.00	5	1	4	4
\$154.....	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	5	\$241.....	159.00	82.00	7	1	6	2
\$262.....	184.50	77.50	9	1	8	0	\$196.....	131.00	65.00	6	1	5	0
\$162.....	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	0							

Receiving assistance for 9 years, but less than 10 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$169	\$123.00	\$46.00	6	1	5	5	\$239	\$158.00	\$81.00	7	1	6	0
\$268	172.50	95.50	7	1	6	6	\$246	205.00	41.00	10	1	9	9
\$252	225.50	26.50	11	2	9	0	\$168	111.00	57.00	5	1	4	2
\$157	106.00	51.00	5	1	4	4	\$138	91.00	47.00	4	1	3	1
\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	3	\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2
\$267	172.00	95.00	7	1	6	3	\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	0
\$60	41.00	19.00	2	1	1	0	\$146	89.50	56.50	3	1	2	0
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	0	\$90	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	0
\$101	82.00	19.00	4	1	3	3	\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	4
\$233	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	1	\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	0
\$180	112.00	68.00	4	1	3	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	1	\$65	38.00	27.00	1	0	1	1
\$213	145.00	68.00	7	1	6	0	\$78	50.00	28.00	2	1	1	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$95	82.00	13.00	4	1	3	0	\$109	65.50	43.50	2	0	2	0
\$75	75.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	0
\$120	82.00	38.00	4	1	3	1	\$110	102.50	7.50	5	1	4	0
\$75	53.50	21.50	2	1	1	1	\$105	73.50	31.50	2	1	1	1
\$154	123.00	31.00	6	1	5	0	\$267	177.50	89.50	8	1	7	7
\$54	41.00	13.00	2	1	1	1	\$131	102.50	28.50	5	1	4	0
\$106	69.50	36.50	3	2	1	0	\$315	212.50	102.50	10	2	8	0
\$147	102.50	44.50	5	1	4	2	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	2
\$210	164.00	46.00	8	1	7	3	\$203	129.00	74.00	5	1	4	2
\$100	66.50	33.50	3	1	2	0	\$211	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	0
\$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	2	\$293	196.00	97.00	9	1	8	6
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	1	\$111	66.50	44.50	2	1	1	1
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$141	102.50	38.50	5	1	4	0
\$99	65.50	33.50	2	0	2	2	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$137	85.00	52.00	3	1	2	0	\$151	123.00	28.00	6	1	5	0
\$136	84.50	51.50	3	0	3	1	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3	\$253	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	2
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	2	\$57	57.00	0	3	1	2	1
\$126	79.50	46.50	3	1	2	0	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	1
\$133	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0	\$160	102.00	58.00	4	1	3	3

Receiving assistance for 10 years, but less than 11 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$105	\$73.50	\$31.50	2	1	1	1	\$169	\$123.00	\$46.00	6	1	5	5
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0	\$268	178.00	90.00	8	2	6	0
\$62	41.50	20.50	1	0	1	0	\$99	65.50	33.50	2	1	1	0
\$109	82.00	27.00	4	1	3	3	\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3
\$120	82.00	38.00	4	0	4	0	\$71	71.00	0	5	2	3	0
\$132	102.50	29.50	5	1	4	3	\$201	133.50	67.50	6	1	5	5
\$68	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$222	144.00	78.00	6	1	5	0	\$111	82.00	29.00	4	1	3	1
\$252	170.00	82.00	8	2	6	0	\$276	182.00	94.00	8	2	6	0
\$143	143.00	0	7	1	6	0	\$167	167.00	0	9	1	8	3
\$55	55.00	0	4	1	3	2	\$106	74.00	32.00	2	1	1	0
\$94	58.00	36.00	2	0	2	2	\$89	89.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$145	94.50	50.50	4	1	3	3	\$211	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	4
\$148	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	0	\$158	158.00	0	9	1	8	3
\$58	41.00	17.00	2	0	2	0	\$255	171.50	83.50	8	1	7	0
\$179	117.00	62.00	5	1	4	1	\$88	55.00	33.00	2	1	1	1
\$130	102.50	27.50	5	2	3	0	\$96	59.00	37.00	2	1	1	1
\$142	93.00	49.00	4	1	3	2	\$227	146.50	80.50	6	1	5	5
\$162	103.00	59.00	4	1	3	3	\$154	93.50	60.50	3	1	2	1
\$239	164.00	75.00	8	1	7	7	\$156	156.00	0	9	1	8	1
\$61	36.00	25.00	1	0	1	0	\$122	72.00	50.00	2	1	1	0
\$192	123.50	68.50	5	1	4	4	\$112	67.00	45.00	2	1	1	1
\$63	37.00	26.00	1	0	1	1	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$166	105.00	61.00	4	1	3	3	\$95	64.00	31.00	3	1	2	0
\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	\$117	69.50	47.50	2	1	1	0
\$208	131.50	76.50	5	1	4	0	\$203	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	5
\$82	61.50	20.50	3	1	2	0	\$174	123.00	51.00	6	1	5	4
\$93	63.00	30.00	3	1	2	0							

Receiving assistance for 11 years, but less than 12 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$106	\$64.00	\$42.00	2	1	1	1	\$77	\$77.00	0	4	1	3	0
\$103	82.00	21.00	4	1	3	0	\$165	104.50	\$60.50	4	1	3	3
\$120	76.50	43.50	3	1	2	0	\$130	87.00	43.00	4	1	3	3
\$167	164.00	3.00	8	1	7	0	\$305	202.00	103.00	9	1	8	1
\$105	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	0	\$69	69.00	0	4	1	3	1
\$136	84.50	51.50	3	1	2	2	\$96	69.50	26.50	3	1	2	0
\$176	110.00	66.00	4	1	3	1	\$246	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	1
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$69	40.00	29.00	1	0	1	0
\$165	90.00	75.00	5	0	5	0	\$168	106.00	62.00	4	1	3	3
\$156	105.50	50.50	5	1	4	0	\$166	116.00	50.00	6	1	5	5

Receiving assistance for 12 years, but less than 13 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$115	\$102.50	\$12.50	5	2	3	0	\$132	\$82.50	\$49.50	3	1	2	2
\$54	32.50	21.50	1	0	1	1	\$167	105.50	61.50	4	0	4	0
\$199	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	\$178	116.50	61.50	5	1	4	4
\$29	29.00	0	2	1	1	0	\$213	139.50	73.50	6	1	5	2
\$136	84.50	51.50	3	0	3	3	\$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	2
\$167	123.00	44.00	6	1	5	1	\$118	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	0
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	0	\$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	1
\$179	111.50	67.50	4	1	3	0	\$41	41.00	0	5	1	4	0
\$38	38.00	0	2	1	1	0	\$309	225.50	83.50	11	1	10	10
\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3	\$178	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
\$184	119.50	64.50	5	1	4	4	\$154	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	2

Receiving assistance for 13 years, but less than 14 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$147	\$90.00	\$57.00	3	1	2	0	\$147	\$105.50	\$41.50	4	1	3	3
\$160	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	1
\$205	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	4	\$75	48.50	26.50	2	1	1	0
\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1	\$192	129.00	63.00	6	1	5	2
\$193	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	3	\$150	102.50	47.50	5	1	4	3
\$184	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	0	\$125	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$113	67.50	45.50	2	0	2	2	\$24	20.50	3.50	1	0	1	1
\$42	26.50	15.50	1	0	1	1	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$247	152.00	95.00	7	1	6	6	\$172	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$176	115.50	60.50	5	1	4	2	\$104	68.50	35.50	3	1	2	0

Receiving assistance for 14 years, but less than 15 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$184-----	\$114.00	\$70.00	4	1	3	0	\$63-----	\$37.00	\$26.00	1	0	1	1
\$243-----	143.50	99.50	4	1	3	1	\$155-----	94.00	61.00	3	1	2	1
\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	2	\$196-----	196.00	0	10	1	9	0
\$70-----	41.00	29.00	2	0	2	2	\$127-----	94.50	32.50	2	1	1	1
\$211-----	133.00	78.00	5	1	4	4	\$193-----	124.00	69.00	5	1	4	0
\$175-----	115.00	60.00	5	1	4	4	\$109-----	82.00	27.00	4	0	4	2
\$105-----	63.50	41.50	2	0	2	2	\$203-----	134.50	68.50	6	1	5	3
\$54-----	54.00	0	3	0	3	1	\$253-----	184.50	68.50	9	1	8	0
\$212-----	144.50	67.50	7	1	6	4	\$263-----	175.50	87.50	8	1	7	0
\$160-----	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	0	\$233-----	149.50	83.50	6	1	5	5
\$118-----	82.00	36.00	4	1	3	0	\$125-----	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$148-----	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$110-----	71.50	38.50	3	1	2	0
\$117-----	82.00	35.00	4	1	3	3	\$123-----	83.50	39.50	4	1	3	0
\$149-----	96.50	52.50	4	1	3	0	\$160-----	96.50	63.50	3	1	2	2
\$149-----	91.00	58.00	3	1	2	0	\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$143-----	93.50	49.50	4	1	3	3	\$125-----	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	0
\$157-----	95.00	62.00	3	1	2	3							

Receiving assistance for 15 years, but less than 16 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total person	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$69.....	\$45.50	\$23.50	2	0	2	2	\$117.....	\$102.50	\$14.50	5	1	4	0
\$90.....	56.00	34.00	2	1	1	1	\$43.....	41.00	2.00	2	0	2	0
\$68.....	61.50	6.50	3	1	2	1	\$88.....	88.00	0	5	2	3	0
\$242.....	165.00	77.00	8	1	7	7	\$178.....	111.00	67.00	4	1	3	3
\$148.....	90.50	57.50	3	1	2	2	\$133.....	83.00	50.00	3	1	2	0
\$112.....	67.00	45.00	2	0	2	2	\$63.....	42.50	20.50	2	0	2	1
\$71.....	71.00	0	4	1	3	0	\$209.....	143.50	65.50	7	1	6	6
\$108.....	82.00	26.00	4	0	4	4	\$94.....	68.00	36.00	2	1	1	1
\$127.....	94.50	32.50	2	1	1	1	\$125.....	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$195.....	130.50	64.50	6	1	5	0	\$205.....	130.00	75.00	5	1	4	1

Receiving assistance for 16 years, but less than 17 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$288-----	\$193.50	\$94.50	9	1	8	8	\$91-----	\$62.00	\$29.00	3	1	2	0
\$43-----	27.00	16.00	1	0	1	1	\$154-----	123.50	30.50	3	1	2	1
\$81-----	51.50	29.50	2	1	1	1	\$86-----	54.00	32.00	2	1	1	1
\$199-----	127.00	72.00	5	1	4	4	\$105-----	102.50	2.50	5	1	4	4
\$146-----	95.00	51.00	4	1	3	3	\$210-----	243.50	166.50	7	1	6	2
\$105-----	63.50	41.50	2	1	1	1	\$211-----	138.50	72.50	6	1	5	4
\$150-----	97.00	53.00	4	1	3	3	\$98-----	98.00	0	8	1	7	2
\$253-----	165.00	88.00	7	1	6	6							

Receiving assistance for 17 years, but less than 18 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$172-----	\$108.00	\$64.00	4	1	3	3	\$250-----	\$225.50	\$24.50	11	1	10	0
\$104-----	82.00	22.00	4	1	3	3	\$170-----	107.00	63.00	4	1	3	3
\$116-----	69.00	47.00	2	1	1	1	\$125-----	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1
\$140-----	102.50	37.50	5	1	4	4	\$172-----	108.00	64.00	4	1	3	3
\$34-----	34.00	0	2	1	1	0	\$206-----	130.50	75.50	5	1	4	0
\$28-----	28.00	0	2	0	2	2							

Receiving assistance for 18 years, but less than 19 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit				Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children					Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate						Total	Illegitimate
\$195.....	\$125.00	\$70.00	5	1	4	4	\$193.....	\$124.00	\$69.00	5	1	4	2
\$127.....	80.00	47.00	3	1	2	2	\$162.....	163.00	59.00	4	1	3	3
\$184.....	114.00	70.00	4	1	3	3	\$154.....	99.00	55.00	4	1	3	0
\$125.....	73.50	51.50	2	1	1	1							

Receiving assistance for 19 years, but less than 20 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
\$140.....	\$102.50	\$37.50	5	1	4	4

Receiving assistance for 20 years, but less than 21 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
\$208.....	\$131.50	\$76.50	5	1	4	1

Receiving assistance for 21 years, but less than 22 years

Amount received	Federal	Local	Number of persons in assistance unit			
			Total persons	Adults	Children	
					Total	Illegitimate
\$125.....	\$73.50	\$51.50	2	1	1	1
\$118.....	70.00	48.00	2	1	1	1

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the man-in-the-house rule by Mr. William R. Galvin, chief of the office of investigations, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia government, as his testimony appeared in the Senate subcommittee hearings.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, explain the man-in-the-house rule.

Mr. GALVIN. This falls under PAD manual section 243, 134. It states and I quote—

"Children living in the home with their mother and a man other than the husband: Children are ineligible because mother as-

sociates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife, and the mother, her children and such man live in a family relationship, regardless of whether such man or such man is the father of the children.

"If the parties contend that the man's presence in the home results from some type of business arrangement, they will be expected to show that the business arrangement is such justification for his being there. For example, a man who claims to be a boarder should be able to establish that he actually pays board and pays an amount sufficient for the mother to realize some profit. While boarding among people of low income does not always include the arrangement for a separate room for the sole use of the boarder, the absence of this arrangement in combination with inadequate evidence that the man pays board or pays sufficient board for the mother to realize a profit would tend to increase the doubt that the supposed business arrangement is the only reason for the man's being in the home."

And under section G of the same manual reference:

"Children living in the home with their mother when there is no clear disassociation from the normal family relationship: Children are ineligible whose mother associates with a man in a relationship similar to that of husband and wife, and the man continues a relationship with the children similar to that of father and child, regardless of whether such men live in the home. Such cases include separation of convenience, and separation for the purpose of becoming eligible for public assistance. The latter may exist because of the departmental rule against supplementing full-time earnings."

The third section is section H:

"Children whose mother maintains a conjugal relationship with a man who is not living in the home. When there is a clear disassociation from the normal family relationship, the mother and/or the child shall if otherwise eligible receive aid to dependent children."

In other words, the relationship of the man in the home must be that of husband to the recipient and father to the children, and it must be beyond a reasonable doubt.

INVESTIGATION CASES CLOSED UNDER MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULES

Senator BYRD. In other words, if you merely found a man in the home at the time of your investigation, or if the social worker finds a man in the home at the time of her visit, this in itself does not make the recipient ineligible?

Mr. GALVIN. No, sir. In the 232 field investigations 111 men were found in the home of the recipients. There were only 69 cases closed because of the man-in-the-home rule.

Senator BYRD. You found men in 111 homes out of the 232?

Mr. GALVIN. We found 111 men in the 232 homes.

Senator BYRD. And how many men did you find in the homes of the 141 cases closed subsequent to investigation?

Mr. GALVIN. We found 87 in those.

Senator BYRD. Eighty-seven in the one hundred forty-one homes?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. You found men in 87 of the 141 homes?

Mr. GALVIN. We found 87 men in the 141 homes.

Senator BYRD. Were some of the 87 legally constituted fathers and husbands?

Mr. GALVIN. Nine were husbands by ceremony, 20 were common law husbands, 9 were landlords living in the same house as the client under questionable living arrangements—

Senator BYRD. Pardon me. You would class those nine as what, as paramours, or what?

Mr. GALVIN. The nine landlords?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. GALVIN. Some of these were paramours. And 49 were friends, paramours, relatives, and roomers. It depends on the living arrangement whether we would classify the landlord as a paramour or not.

Senator BYRD. But a portion of the 49 were relatives?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. Not paramours?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right.

Senator BYRD. Do you know how many?

Mr. GALVIN. We do not have that breakdown.

Since only 69 cases were closed for that reason, there would be 18 that did not fall under the rule.

Senator BYRD. Sixty-nine were closed because of what?

Mr. GALVIN. Because of the man-in-the-house rule, the continuing absence or no

clear disassociation rule, 69 cases were closed. There were 87 men found in the various homes. So 18 of the men that we found were not in this relationship.

Senator BYRD. Were not paramours?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. They were either husbands, common law husbands, or husbands by ceremony?

Mr. GALVIN. No, sir. The 69 includes some of the husbands and the 20 common law husbands also. The 18 would include friends, relatives, visitors, those that did not have a relationship similar to that of husband and wife.

PARAMOURS IN CLOSED CASES

Senator BYRD. So in the 89 instances in which there were men involved—87, I believe you said—in the 87 instances, how many were strictly paramours? Can you give us that figure? How many of these were closed on the basis that they were not legal husbands, but that they were paramours?

Mr. GALVIN. There were 9 husbands by legal ceremony, 20 by common law, for a total of 29. This would mean that 40 would be paramours in the closed cases.

Senator BYRD. Aren't some of the remaining number relatives, and so on?

Mr. GALVIN. That would be in the 18 left over.

Senator BYRD. I see. So you would have 40 paramours out of 89?

Mr. GALVIN. Eighty-seven. Forty out of the eighty-seven were paramours.

Senator BYRD. Now, percentage-wise what is this?

Mr. GALVIN. Forty-six percent.

Senator BYRD. Forty-six percent of what, now?

Mr. GALVIN. Forty-six percent of the 87 men found in the home were paramours. And in 58 percent of the cases closed for men in the home, which was 69 cases, the men were paramours.

HOUSE HEARINGS

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, how do you square these figures with what you said when you appeared before the House subcommittee? On page 1262 of the House hearings you stated to the subcommittee these words:

"It is our estimate that if there were a change in this policy, and if the District were to extend the aid to the unemployed, there would be approximately 17 percent of the cases of the 285 found ineligible rather than the present percentage of 58 percent."

You go on to say:

"This 17 percent is not in any sense a firm figure, but the reason given for closing as reflected in the investigators report seemed to indicate that somewhere between 17 and 20 percent of the cases would be found ineligible for reasons other than the man-in-the-home policy or the unemployed person or the employed person in the household."

So in two sentences you come up with two different statements, in one you say 17 percent, and in the next one you say somewhere between 17 and 20.

And then on page 1264, two pages beyond, you say: "Our best estimate is 17 to 20 percent."

And then at the bottom of the page in your next statement you say—

"Assuming the policy on the man in the home were to be changed, and if the District were to extend aid to the unemployed, I don't believe there would be a very large percentage much beyond 17. Maybe it would go to 25 percent."

So you increase your prognostication by almost 50 percent when you go from 17 to 25 percent.

PERCENT OF INELIGIBLES NOT FALLING UNDER MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Now, according to your figures there, Mr. Galvin, what percent of the total ineligible do not fall under the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. GALVIN. Forty-eight percent do not fall under the rule if we use 69, subtract 69 from 1932, which is the closed cases at the moment. We have 63 cases, 63 cases over 132 is 48 percent that could not come under the man-in-the-house rule.

OTHER INELIGIBILITY FACTORS

Senator BYRD. Before I get back to you, Mr. Shea, what percent of the cases disqualified in the report by reason of the man-in-the-house rule would have been disqualified notwithstanding the man-in-the-house rule, because other eligibility factors were found which in themselves would have disqualified the recipient?

Mr. GALVIN. I have no figures on that.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lang, do you have them?

Mr. LANG. We have a breakdown in a slightly different category, since we are basing it on 133 cases where we determined that some ineligibility findings existed. Now, in those 133 cases there were 69 cases in which a man-in-the-house situation was one of the ineligibility factors. Of those 69 cases, 37 were considered to be ineligible solely on that basis, leaving 32 which investigation disclosed involved other ineligibility factors besides the one involving the man-in-the-house rule.

Now, of the 37 cases which were considered ineligible solely because of that finding, we determined that in 24 they were employed, the men were employed. In 32 of the 69 there were ineligibility factors other than the man-in-the-house rule.

Senator BYRD. You are saying that of the 69 cases that were disqualified under the man-in-the-house rule—is that what you are saying—

Mr. LANG. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That of the 69, 32 cases could very well have been disqualified on the basis of other eligibility factors which came to light during the investigation?

Mr. LANG. That is right.

CASES CLOSED SOLELY ON MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

Senator BYRD. So that we have this hard core—let's get down to the hard core—of how many ineligible cases based on the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. LANG. That would be 37 cases.

Senator BYRD. Thirty-seven out of the one hundred and what?

Mr. LANG. 133.

Senator BYRD. Now, that is the hard core. What percentage is that?

Mr. LANG. Approximately 28 percent.

Senator BYRD. So approximately 28 percent come under the hard core man-in-the-house rule. You are saying that 72 percent of these, even if no man-in-the-house rule were in existence in the District of Columbia, would still have been ineligible; is that what you are saying?

Mr. LANG. That is right.

Senator BYRD. And do you say to us that in any consideration of the man-in-the-house rule, one must eliminate those cases which could be found ineligible because of other reasons?

INELIGIBLES FOR OTHER THAN MAN-IN-THE-HOUSE RULE

In other words, if the man-in-the-house rule were nonexistent, many of the same cases—

Mr. LANG. A total of 78 percent.

Senator BYRD. Seventy-eight percent would be ineligible on the basis of other factors?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Mr. LANG. Pardon me, that was 72 percent rather than 78 percent.

Senator BYRD. Seventy-two percent.

RECAPITULATION OF INELIGIBILITY FACTORS

Would you like to recapitulate for the record, Mr. Lang, now that you have made that correction?

Mr. LANG. There were 69 cases out of the 133 which we determined to contain ineligibility factors. Sixty-nine were based on the application of the man-in-the-house rule. In 32 of these 69 cases there were other factors also present, any one of which was sufficient to have determined the recipients ineligible, leaving 37 which contained only the one factor, that being the one relating to the man-in-the-house rule. The 37 percent amounts to 27—

Senator BYRD. You mean the 37 cases.

Mr. LANG. The 37 cases amounts to approximately 28 percent of the total number which were found to be ineligible.

Senator BYRD. On the basis of the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. LANG. It is 28 percent of the total number which were found to be ineligible.

Senator BYRD. On the basis of the man-in-the-house rule?

Mr. LANG. On all factors, 28 percent was on the basis of the man-in-the-house rule; yes sir.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain statements made by Mr. Bernard Scholz, who was the Chief of the Public Assistance Division of the Department of Welfare at the time we held the hearings last year.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY MR. SCHOLZ

Senator BYRD. All right.

Now, Mr. Scholz, I think that you are in the best position to indicate to us what should be done to put this department on its proper course, weed out the ineligible, provide for the needy, cut out the red tape and the paperwork, and thus permit the Department to go forward with a well-charted program which will earn for it the respect and high regard, not only of those people who are being served by it, but also of the people who help support it with their tax dollars.

Now could you in a somewhat brief fashion let us have your advice and counsel on this matter before we recess?

Mr. SCHOLZ. Yes, sir.

Now?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. SCHOLZ. All right.

SOCIAL SERVICE STAFF NOT EQUIPPED FOR INVESTIGATION

I believe that what we have learned from this painful experience is that our social service staff is not equipped to do the investigative job that needs to be done with today's caseload.

Senator BYRD. Now you may have to speak just a little louder. There seems to be some difficulty in hearing you.

Mr. SCHOLZ. All right.

I believe that we have learned from the painful experience of the past few months that our social service staff is not equipped to do the job it is expected to do with today's caseload. We are operating with social workers, and when we hire caseworkers

all our specifications are written that way, all our instructions are written that way, we expect them to do the old type of social work which is a helping relationship. We tried to create a public image that the social worker is not a snoop who looks under the bed and in the closet, but is as one well-known training film put it, a friend at the door. And as a result of relationship has been built up which is not realistic, where the social workers, as the Social Security Administration puts it, uses the clients, the applicant, as the primary source of information. And we find this information is not reliable.

CHANGES IN CHARACTER OF CLIENTS

This may all have been true at the time when the program started, when we had the so-called nice people on relief, the widows and orphans who have been siphoned off since then by the survivors benefits program and when we had the families that were unbroken, where the man was disabled and except for the financial assistance they would not have been able to manage. They have been siphoned off by the disability insurance program. And what we are having now is the bottom of the barrel, without wanting to cast any aspersions on the worthwhile people we have on assistance. Most of them, as our investigation now has shown, are problem cases. They are, as Mr. Lang pointed out, people with problems of alcoholism, drug addiction, with criminal records, and are not the type of people whom social workers are trained to deal with.

EDUCATION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

In addition, when we are talking about trained social workers, we are deluding ourselves and the public, because these people have not gone through the school of social work. A recent survey by the Social Security Administration showed that of, I think it is, 25,000 public assistance workers in the country, only 1.2 percent have a school of social work education. The others are trained by the apprenticeship method that I mentioned. They go through an 8-week training course and then are let loose on a caseload which in our instance amounts to 180 cases, and where a worker with an apprenticeship training of 8 weeks is responsible for dispensing \$17,000 monthly of the taxpayers' money. And that is an impossible situation. I think we are putting a responsibility on these young people that they are simply not able to carry.

So what we are doing in effect is the same as if we were taking medical corpsmen and saying to them, "now take over this hospital and perform brain surgery." And the results are what we have found them to be. We know that similar results would be found anywhere—am shocked at the extent of them—similar lacking in effectiveness as we now find in the method of control, the method of review we have used. We have had in the beginning of the program an audit undertaken by auditors that was found inadequate because they were not trained in eligibility determination. So since 1941 the Social Security Administration has instituted what they call an administrative review made by social work technicians. They have come to our agency time and again and reviewed a sample of our caseload and have always confirmed that we were doing a fine job, that we had an unusually low number of ineligible. In fact, there have been two investigative staffs appointed by congressional committees—I think it was the House Appropriations Committee—who have reviewed our cases and again came up with the same findings.

PAPERWORK REVIEW

Senator BYRD. But again was this not a paperwork operation?

Mr. SCHOLZ. It was a paperwork review. Still thinking in paperwork terms, in 1959 at my request the agency instituted this sample case review by which unit supervisors review a sample of 5 percent of the cases against a very detailed form to find out where our weaknesses are, where our procedures or policies should be tightened up, and again this seems a fine thing. Again we got laudatory remarks from the Federal agency.

Then the special investigation project came, and we suddenly stood before the shambles of what we had thought was a sound, valid caseload. So that what we know today is that we have to have a method of spot reviewing out in the field so we really know what is going on.

This is where we are in social service. We should, I believe, use social service workers after the validity of a caseload has been established, to work with these families, to try to educate them, motivate them, rehabilitate them, which is what they are required to do—more or less.

RESPONSIBILITY IN DETERMINING GRANTS

Senator BYRD. So you are saying the social worker should not have the responsibility of determining the eligibility and the amount of grant?

Mr. SCHOLZ. I think they have signally failed in doing that. I hate to admit it, but those are the facts.

Senator BYRD. But you say this should not be the responsibility of the social worker?

INVESTIGATION SERVICE

Mr. SCHOLZ. That is right.

Now when the Investigation Service came in in 1955, their assignment was quite different from what it is today. They were again to be a helpful arm of our social administration. They were to help find the fugitive fathers, so that the mothers could go to court and file a complaint for non-support. And they have been outstandingly successful. I believe, the average number of men located is still over 90 percent. Is that correct, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

SHIFT OF WORK TO SERVICE

Mr. SCHOLZ. But in the process of finding these missing fathers, they found some of these "missing" fathers were not missing at all, but they turned up in the homes which they supposedly had deserted. So, gradually, the emphasis has shifted and more and more the Investigation Service has been used to investigate the home itself. Has this "deserted" mother been deserted or have these "abandoned" children been abandoned? And naturally with a new service they had to learn their lesson, too.

As you know from the reports that the special investigation project brought in, in many instances the Investigation Service had made an earlier investigation. Every case where the mother claims she has been deserted, at the time of application is routinely referred to the Investigation Service. Every case where the worker has evidence, or has a complaint, that there is a man in the house, is referred to the Investigation Service. In many instances the Investigation Service gave the case a clean bill of health, only to find to their own dismay under the special investigation project that they, too, had not found the true facts. So they have developed, we believe, under the procedures of the special investigation project a new approach to investigation which seems to be much more realistic, much more successful, than anything that had been developed before.

CHANGE IN METHOD OF APPLICATION

And seeing how successful they have been, I would say that it would be the wrong

thing if we continued our present procedure where social workers, with inadequate means and methods, put a family on assistance, and then we get the Investigation Service to ferret out the ineligible. I think a much more logical procedure would be to have people make application to our social workers, who determine whether or not they seem to fall within the scope of our program at all, and at that point we refer them to the Investigation Service. And we would make it clear to the applicant that the Investigation Service will establish whether or not there is eligibility. So that at least at the point where we open the case, we are reasonably assured of eligibility. And I have suggested this type of procedure to Mr. Shea.

PRESENT METHOD OF INVESTIGATION UNIT WORK

Now at present the investigation service works only on cases referred by the social workers, and there is no check on them, which has made for a morale problem. Because when the investigators did not find the man in the house no one gave them a black eye, but if they did find the man in the house, the social service had the black eye for not having found this before. So that perhaps just as we are trying to set up a method of control, it may be necessary to set up a control of the controllers. That is something Mr. Galvin will have to decide, and I am sure he is fully capable of doing that. So that is one, perhaps, radical departure—

Senator BYRD. Let me make one comment. I do not think the Comptroller General in his three reports—and if I am incorrect please point out my mistake—took this position you have just taken regarding the need for controlling the investigators.

Mr. SCHOLZ. It may have been our own feeling that every case in which the investigation found something, where we have been on the case for several years and had not found it, that this was a failure, this was a black mark on our record.

Senator BYRD. But you are not implying that that in itself would be an indictment of the investigative service?

Mr. SCHOLZ. Good heavens, no. No.

CONTINUOUS CASELOAD

And there is the other problem that the caseload is not standing still. It is a fantastically dynamic caseload. People are moving by the thousands each year. And I do not know what kind of method we would be able to develop so that the investigation service could continue to keep tabs on the facts of eligibility.

At present caseworkers are expected to make an annual review. If we had enough of an investigative staff I would prefer to see the case transferred once a year to the investigation service and again have them go and take a hard look at the facts of the situation and recertify that this case is eligible. I realize that we cannot put surveillance on every case, and that 1 month after we have found a case eligible, the situation may change.

MISREPRESENTATION BY CLAIMANTS

Senator BYRD. And you would also say that with the degree of misrepresentation being what it has been found to be by the Comptroller General, to say nothing of your own people, it makes it extremely difficult for even the best social worker and best investigator to find these situations and keep the record clean?

Mr. SCHOLZ. That is true. I mean, we do know we have second and third generation recipients who know our procedures much better than our young social workers and who elude us with the greatest skill. And as the special investigation project has

shown, in some cases only intensive surveillance of a type that is entirely beyond the scope we had ever undertaken, will uncover this type of situation.

HUNGRY CHILDREN HEARINGS

Now what I suggested will still not entirely solve our problems because, as Mr. Shea pointed out, we have staff shortages, and our program responsibilities have constantly increased over the past few years without the increases in staff keeping step with them. I need only remind the chairman that when I came in 1956 to the agency, the first thing that happened were the so-called hungry children hearings, and all of a sudden a special emergency food order program was ordered, the staff was drawn off their regular duties and worked day, and in some instances until 10 o'clock at night, on those special assignments.

And as you know with the heavy caseload we have, it means that there was need for a lot of reviews, there was need for a lot of actions which it is almost impossible ever to catch up with again.

INCREASE IN AVERAGE PAYMENTS

On July 1 the new procedure came into effect—I speak of 1957—where the Juvenile Court would pay the support payments into the Treasury, and where our staff would have to give the full amount of assistance. This had the dual effect that the average assistance grant went up and that many cases became eligible which under the order procedure would not have been. At the same time the \$200 ceiling was lifted and again that made a new caseload eligible and increased the average payments.

There was tremendous community pressure for us to speed up our intake process. At that time we had waiting lists of as long as 6 weeks. The community agencies resented that they had to pay the support of families who were under the regulations eligible for public assistance. So an emergency assistance procedure was initiated and presumptive eligibility became permissible, which means again people became eligible who under the old regulations would never have been reached. A person who came out of the hospital and had a convalescence period of 4 or 6 weeks would never have been reached during the time when we had a waiting period, and now he appeared on our assistance rolls. So again the number of assistance cases went up.

NEED FOR INCREASED STAFF

Senator BYRD. Now, Mr. Scholz, I do not want us to go afield. If what you are saying is basically your recommendations, that is fine, but I am just wondering if you are still telling us what should be done to deal with this situation.

Now we have talked 2 weeks about what has happened and I am not critical of what you are saying, but I think our objective now is to not look back so much but to look ahead at this point. Let us know what further suggestions and recommendations you have.

Mr. SCHOLZ. Yes, sir. I am leading directly up to this. And that is the point, that under community pressures to speed up the application process we were given more application workers. We were not given more caseworkers. So that really what has happened is what we all do not want: We are speeding up the buildup of the caseloads without having enough staff to keep control of the caseloads. We asked for more workers on various occasions and, as you know, the staff was denied. In 1959 we asked for 20 assistant unit clerks to keep down the amount of paperwork the workers had to do, and they were denied.

We had surveys. We requested a survey in 1958. We had a survey by the Management Office, a survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have had since then two surveys by two task forces. Each survey takes up time, a great deal of staff time.

APPLICATION OF SURVEYS

Senator BYRD. At that point, do you think you are having too many surveys and not enough application of the findings?

Mr. SCHOLZ. If I may speak frankly for the feeling of my staff, we feel we have been surveyed to death but not enough has come out of it.

Senator BYRD. I see.

NEW PROCESSING SYSTEMS

Mr. SCHOLZ. Recommendations have been made for the installation of IBM equipment, for the installation of the addressograph system. But the addressograph system has been crippled. We have the machines to make the plates, and we have the plates, but we do not have the addressograph machine for mass-runs of the plates, which is an essential part of the total plan. IBM has been held up because the District is planning a large overall computer system, so everyone has been holding their breath, and in the meantime we have been left without the necessary equipment.

On several occasions this committee has asked for information which theoretically we should have at our fingertips. We have made out social data cards, but we have no equipment to evaluate them by IBM and make the information instantly available. We have installed controls trying to assure that prompt action is taken on cases, but again the control has to be hand operated.

We have finally been able to establish a position—you may call it a production manager but it is called program analysis—which produces for use figures on: how many hours does each worker spend in the field, how many visits does he make, how many cases does he receive, how many transfers, and so on. All this tabulation, again, has to be done by hand.

We feel that our agency is still in the horse-and-buggy stage as far as modern business methods are concerned, and with a program of \$16 million we are big business, and I think we should be able to function like big business.

So we are pleading for help, not through surveys, but through application of what we know will be needed in order to enable us to function effectively.

CENTRALIZING SERVICES

I have briefly touched on the difficulty of the somewhat diffused responsibility on the part of the division chief, which is something that maybe is districtwide, that certain functions have been taken out of the various departments and have been centralized, so that the statistical service is in one place, the financial service in another place, and so on. I have no control over this. And when I need information, they may need their staff for child welfare or for some other operation, and I am faced again with having the workers furnish urgent and needed information by saying "stop everything and count cases." This is the picture, sir.

Senator BYRD. I think that is a fine summary, Mr. Scholz, and very articulately presented.

Mr. SCHOLZ. I thank you, sir.

Senator BYRD. I would assume that you have benefited from these hearings and the testimony that has been adduced, just as we on the subcommittee have increased our knowledge by it. Is that correct?

Mr. SCHOLZ. Yes, sir.

JUSTIFICATION OF SPECIAL INVESTIGATION PROJECTS

Senator BYRD. I will ask this one final question of you. Do you feel that the special investigation project was justified?

Mr. SCHOLZ. Obviously; yes, sir.
Senator BYRD. Thank you, Mr. Scholz.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table on

foster home board rates in the surrounding counties of Maryland and Virginia.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Board rates—Surrounding counties of Maryland and Virginia

[County supplements State standards]

	State	County	September 1961		State	County	September 1961
(1) Montgomery County: Regular board rate: Infants to 6 years.....	\$36.50	\$42.50	Approximate number of foster homes: 178; number of children in foster homes: 400.	(3) Fairfax County: Basic foster care rate (all ages)....	\$50.00	-----	Approximate number of foster homes September 1961: 100; number of children in foster homes: 314.
6 to 12 years.....	44.00	48.00		Clothing allowances: 1 to 5 years.....	-----	\$5.00	
12 and over.....	53.00	54.00		6 to 9 years.....	-----	6.00	
Allowance for clothing, school supplies, and recreation: Infants to 6 years.....	8.50	-----		10 to 12 years.....	-----	7.00	
6 to 12 years.....	13.00	-----		Over 12.....	-----	10.00	
12 and over.....	16.00	-----		School supplies (a month for all children of school age). Spending money: 1st to 3d grade.....	-----	.75	
Special care rate (regardless of age (emotionally and physically handicapped children)).	75.00	-----		4th to 5th.....	-----	1.00	
Residential institution rate (department of education supplements this rate by \$50).	150.00	-----		6th to 7th.....	-----	1.25	
Basic clothing outfit issued.....	-----	-----		8th through high school.....	-----	1.50	
(2) Prince Georges County: Regular board rate: Infants to 6 years.....	45.00	-----	Number of foster homes: 118; number of children in foster homes: 300.	Special care rate ² (plus allowance as shown). 60.00	-----	-----	
6 to 12 years.....	57.00	-----		(4) Arlington County: Regular board rate: Infants to 1 year.....	-----	53.00	Approximate number of foster homes September 1961: 75; number of children in foster homes: 142.
12 and over.....	69.00	-----		1 to 12 years.....	-----	50.00	
Preadoptive care rate: Infants to 6 years.....	58.50	-----		12 to 21 years.....	-----	56.00	
6 to 12 years.....	63.00	-----		Allowances: 4 to 6 years.....	-----	1.00	
12 and over.....	69.00	-----		6 to 8 years.....	-----	1.50	
Special care rate: ¹ Infants to 6 years (board, \$75 plus clothing, \$8.50 or \$2.50 per diem).	83.50	-----		8 to 10 years.....	-----	2.50	
6 to 12 years.....	88.00	-----		10 to 12 years.....	-----	3.50	
12 and over.....	91.00	-----		12 to 18 years.....	-----	5.00	
				Special care rates ³	-----	None	

¹ Purchase of care on as paid basis for children in residential treatment centers—not to exceed \$150 a month (department of education supplements this by \$50). Basic clothing outfit issued.

² County is now trying to establish group homes for teenagers—offering subsidy of \$10 a month, \$60 board plus allowances.

³ Clothing is requisitioned by worker and authorized by agency.

Board rates for foster care in Alexandria, Va., as of December 1962

Age group of child	Room and board	Clothing	Personal care	Allowances	School supplies	Total	Age group of child	Room and board	Clothing	Personal care	Allowances	School supplies	Total
Infants.....	\$45	\$1.50	\$1.50	-----	-----	\$48	6 to 13 years.....	\$45	\$6.00	\$1.50	\$2	\$0.50	\$55
1 to 5 years.....	45	5.50	1.50	\$1	-----	53	14 years and over.....	45	9.00	2.50	2	.50	59

NOTE.—Basic clothing outfit issued. Foster parent supplements from clothing allowance. Shoes provided from a private fund.

Rates for foster care of children in Baltimore, Md.; St. Louis, Mo.; New York, N.Y.; and Philadelphia, Pa.

Kind of care	Board		Monthly clothing	Preadded totals, monthly	Kind of care	Board		Monthly clothing	Preadded totals, monthly
	Monthly	Per diem ¹				Monthly	Per diem ¹		
Regular care (local department and purchase of care): Infant up to 2.....	\$50	\$1.65	\$8.50	\$58.50	Preadoptive care (local department): Infant up to 6.....	\$50	\$1.65	\$8.50	\$58.50
2 up to 6.....	40	1.35	8.50	48.50	6 up to 12.....	50	1.65	14.00	64.00
6 up to 12.....	44	1.45	14.00	58.00	12 and over.....	53	1.75	18.00	71.00
12 and over.....	53	1.75	18.00	71.00	Special care (local department): Infant up to 6.....	75	2.50	8.50	83.50
					6 up to 12.....	75	2.50	14.00	89.00
					12 and over.....	75	2.50	18.00	93.00

¹ 1/30 monthly rate rounded to nearest 0.05.

	Board		Monthly clothing ²
	Monthly as paid not to exceed—	Per diem ¹ as paid not to exceed—	
Special care (purchase of care).....	\$150	\$5.00	-----
Emergency care (local department).....	75	2.50	-----

¹ 1/30 monthly rate rounded to nearest 0.05.

² Initial clothing as needed see schedule C.

Standard for determining the cost of clothing including clothing upkeep, personal care, and school supplies

Age group	Regular monthly amount	Initial clothing "as needed," total amount not to exceed amounts specified below
Infant up to 6.....	\$8.50	\$44
6 up to 12.....	14.00	57
12 and over.....	18.00	72

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table showing the daily average population of in-

stitutions in the District of Columbia for the fiscal years 1959 through 1963; and a study of 50 families terminated or ineligible for public assistance, entitled "The Ineligibles," plus testimony ad-

duced during the hearings pertaining to this study.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Daily average population of institutions and population at end of year by race and by sex, fiscal years 1959-63

Institution	Daily average population	Total under care at end of year ¹				Institution	Daily average population	Total under care at end of year ¹			
		Race		Sex				Race		Sex	
		White	Non-white	Male	Female			White	Non-white	Male	Female
1959											
Maple Glen School.....	190	22	198	220	-----	District of Columbia Village.....	638	308	371	360	319
Cedar Knoll School.....	408	62	425	310	177	Municipal Lodging House.....	35	15	12	27	-----
District Training School.....	843	591	792	808	575	Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors.....	36	40	2	42	-----
Junior Village.....	349	57	307	225	139	1962					
Receiving Home.....	76	18	80	81	17	Maple Glen School.....	223	34	173	204	3
District of Columbia Village.....	615	300	329	346	283	Cedar Knoll School.....	420	38	382	296	124
Municipal Lodging House.....	39	25	19	44	-----	District Training School.....	1,062	644	1,061	980	725
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors.....	32	37	-----	37	-----	Junior Village.....	519	54	545	343	256
1960											
Maple Glen School.....	224	33	207	240	-----	Receiving Home.....	110	15	126	169	32
Cedar Knoll School.....	456	54	470	356	168	District of Columbia Village.....	668	307	375	361	321
District Training School.....	898	618	936	907	647	Municipal Lodging House.....	33	16	14	30	-----
Junior Village.....	423	65	399	268	206	Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors.....	41	43	3	46	-----
Receiving Home.....	104	12	90	81	21	1963					
District of Columbia Village.....	599	284	345	318	311	Maple Glen School.....	211	24	196	216	4
Municipal Lodging House.....	39	18	14	32	-----	Cedar Knoll School.....	454	37	447	336	148
Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors.....	35	17	1	28	-----	District Training School.....	1,111	657	1,125	1,025	757
1961											
Maple Glen School.....	215	42	199	238	3	Junior Village.....	693	60	699	437	322
Cedar Knoll School.....	470	51	416	310	167	Receiving Home.....	122	21	77	80	18
District Training School.....	1,002	631	998	946	683	District of Columbia Village.....	674	307	381	372	316
Junior Village.....	489	66	373	261	188	Municipal Lodging House.....	31	10	11	21	-----
Receiving Home.....	105	10	95	84	21	Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors.....	43	46	3	49	-----

¹ Includes residents not currently in but under care of the institution.

THE INELIGIBLES—A STUDY OF 50 FAMILIES TERMINATED OR INELIGIBLE FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

(Submitted to Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., August 1963)

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 6, 1963.

MR. ISADORE SEEMAN,

Director, Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SEEMAN: I am pleased to submit the final report on our study of Washington families whose welfare benefits have been terminated, and to express the bureau's appreciation of the Health and Welfare Council's assistance in carrying out the work. Abraham Makofsky's cooperation in arranging the participation of private welfare agencies was particularly important.

Several private groups—Hospitality House, Catholic Charities, the Salvation Army, the Neighborhood Service Project, and Family and Child Services—guided us to some of the cases included in the study and interviewers were provided by three of these agencies: Mayor Eupha Gibson (Salvation Army), Edward Yates (Neighborhood Service Project), and Erna Koranyi (Family and Child Services). Bureau interviewers included James Fair, Rosa Greene, Lorenzo McCormick, Melvin Moore, Isaac Rowland, Charles Talley, Theodore Trabue, and Herman Williams. Ann Richardson of the bureau staff directed the study.

We are indebted to the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation for partial support of the project through a fund previously granted to the bureau for research on behalf of local eleemosynary organizations.

Respectfully,

ROBERT T. BOWER.

INTRODUCTION

The present study was undertaken at the request of the Health and Welfare Council of the National Capital Area for the purpose of ascertaining some of consequences of termination of welfare grants to public welfare recipients. The investigation was designed to reveal the ways in which terminated families were better or worse off at the time of the interviews than they were when they were receiving public assistance. As the evidence was gradually assembled and analyzed, it became apparent that the termination of public assistance did in general constitute a crisis for these families. At the same time, the study disclosed a pattern of existence or style of life which seems to be characteristic of this segment of the poor, in which the crisis precipitated by termination of public assistance was another event, another deprivation in a series of ups and downs which characterizes their lives in general. The following report is essentially comprised of two elements: a delineation of some of the effects of termination and a general description of the manner in which 50 poor families meet some of the problems of day-to-day existence.

The people who contributed information for this analysis were 50 women who (with one exception) had, sometime between September 1961 and April 1963, been terminated or suspended from the public assistance rolls (41 people) or had applied for public assistance and been refused (9 people).¹

Ideally, the 50 cases would have been selected at random from a list of all terminated welfare recipients. Since the welfare records were not made available, it was necessary to choose respondents by several differ-

ent methods. Eighteen of them were people who had recently applied for help from one of five private welfare agencies. The remainder were located by a variety of techniques: interviews were assigned to a door-to-door canvass of certain blocks in three census tracts with high public assistance rates in 1960; one interviewer canvassed all 577 units of a public housing project; other interviewers were instructed to ask respondents and others they met whether they knew of anyone who would fit the study criteria and to attempt to interview them. This "sampling" plan, which might best be described as accidental, and the small number of cases, impose limitations on the interpretation of findings and the extent to which generalizations can be made that would apply to all terminated welfare cases in the District. It is certain that applicants to private agencies are overrepresented and these could either be the more needy and desperate families or those who were more resourceful than others in seeking solutions to their plight. It is equally certain that the nets missed families who had left the scene—split up to live with relatives or left town. The procedures also tend to miss the geographically and socially isolated cases. It is probable, therefore, that the 50 families included in the study are more stable than a true sample would have been.

Time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent in which the investigator used a structured interview form. A more intensive case-study approach, following the family through a considerable period of time after the termination of assistance, would have been far preferable, in allowing for the collection of more detailed information and in permitting a closer account of the stages of adjustment to the new situation which the families faced. This constitutes another limitation to the current study.

¹ At the time of the interview, 4 of the terminées had just been reinstated; the other 46 were without public assistance.

The "typical" respondent in our sample is a 30-year-old Negro woman with 9 years of formal education. She has lived in Washington for 22 years, is married but separated from her husband. She lives in a four-room-and-bath apartment with her five children, more than half of them being of preschool age. She is not employed. Welfare payments were terminated about 8 months ago. These features vary widely among the 50 families, as do the adjustments they have made to the termination of public welfare. In the report that follows, we have attempted to describe some patterns in the lives and responses to welfare termination among the 50 cases. The reader is cautioned against assuming uniformity among the cases, given the great variation that exists. Generalizing about all terminated cases is also dangerous because of the possible biases produced by methods of sampling.

POSTTERMINATION ADJUSTMENT

The sequence of posttermination events: In examining the data, one can find a fairly coherent configuration of posttermination events. Immediately after termination of

public assistance, income drops almost to zero for some time, followed by a gradual recovery, until, about 8 months later, the family income seems to be about two-thirds of its original level. This period appears to be one of gradual partial recovery, during which short-term help patterns may be established, and money or noncash contributions from friends or relatives may be obtained. Meanwhile, payments for such things as rent and utilities are deferred in order to provide food. If all goes well, the family is not evicted, and is able to establish a precarious survival system. It appears that the indebtedness established during the early period following termination probably stays at about the same level with the specific creditors varying. A good illustration of the early part of the adjustment period is afforded by respondent No. 41. Her public assistance grant was terminated in March of 1963. In April she received food from two private agencies. In May she also got help from two private agencies, one of them the same as the previous month, the other a new one. She had let her rent and gas bills go unpaid. Her

cash income at the time of the interview was about a third lower than it had been when she was under public welfare. This case also illustrates one of the most important differences between the public assistance period and the nonpublic assistance period. Cash income may have been only 33-percent higher before, but it was regular and came from a reliable source. Current income, on the other hand, is gathered pretty much from day to day, and depends almost entirely on whether the family can make arrangements to get help from a private agency, or can find someone who is willing temporarily to help.

The poverty status: To establish the relative economic position of these families, data on their income were compared with two income measures of "poverty," one based on estimates compiled for New York City, which has a cost of living similar to Washington, and the second based on regional figures (including rural and urban areas) with, naturally, a lower cost of living calculation. It will be seen in table 1 that by either measure, these families would be classed as poor.

TABLE 1.—Relationship between estimates of income requirements and income, per month (ex-recipients only)

	Average need	Average current income	Percent of need	Average public assistance period income	Percent of need		Average need	Average current income	Percent of need	Average public assistance period income	Percent of need
Estimate No. 1 ¹	\$372	-----	30	-----	44	Estimate No. 2 ²	\$205	\$113	55	\$163	80

¹ Calculated on the basis of estimates of the cost of living "used by private agencies in New York City to determine eligibility for assistance and free medical care." It takes into account the employment status of the head of household and other adults, the ages of children, and the number of people living in the housing unit. From James N. Morgan et al., "Income and Welfare in the United States."

² Calculated on the basis of "the monthly budget considered necessary for ADC families." It takes into account size of family, race, and area of residence. The figures in the table are slight underestimates of requirements for the area which includes the

District of Columbia. From M. Elaine Burgess and Daniel O. Price, "An American Dependency Challenge."

NOTE.—There have been, of course, several other estimates of the income which divides the "poor" from the "less poor." For example, according to Robert Lampman's criteria, used in his "The Low Income Population and Economic Growth," these families would each require an average of about \$300 per month to avoid being poor. The Morgan et al., and Burgess and Price estimates were used here because they take into account some of the characteristics of this particular group.

There is considerable variation among the families in their income relative to estimates of need. According to the Morgan estimates, two ex-recipient families have current cash incomes about equal to their estimated needs. Using the lower regional estimates of Burgess and Price, 10 of the families have incomes above minimal requirements. On the other hand, five respondents said that at the time of the interview they had no cash income at all. The range for the bulk of the families is from 50 to 70 percent below requirements on the first estimate and between 30 to 60 percent below on the second.

MODES OF ADAPTATION

The interviews developed only limited data on the ways in which people cope with poverty. They do provide grounds for preliminary description, however, at least at an impressionistic and anecdotal level.

The attempts of the families to fill the gap between their income and the requirements of their families vary from a rather active and energetic search for new sources of support to what appears to be a passive resignation to disaster. On the more active level, 14 respondents found part-time or full-time jobs (and more sought employment unsuccessfully following termination of public assistance). This relatively low rate of employment is probably partially explained by the wages these women are able to earn. Judging from their current and past employment, most of them are able to find work only as domestic, counter girls, and in similar unskilled occupations with low rates of pay. Indeed, 10 of the ex-public assistance respondents who went to work following termination showed a monthly income below that of the public assistance period.

Another important factor here is the age of the respondents' children. Almost three-fourths of the children are under 10 years of age. A minority of them are of school age, and most must somehow be cared for during

the mother's working hours. However, the cost of regular child care often approaches or surpasses income from low-paying employment. To be sure, some respondents who live with parents or other nonemployed adults might be able to arrange for free child care, but these are in the minority.

A second kind of active response, and one which seems to be used frequently, is the appeal for occasional help to private welfare agencies. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents applied for help to at least one private agency, and 46 percent received aid of various kinds, including clothing, food, emergency rent payments to avoid eviction, intercession with landlords to put off eviction, short-term housing, advice and referral, toys and Christmas bundles, etc. These figures, of course, are probably inflated beyond what one would expect for terminated public welfare cases as a whole, since so many of the families included in the study (about a third of the total) were discovered through the rolls of private agencies.

Some respondents find it necessary to enter into dependence relationships of various types in order to sustain themselves and their children, although they frequently consider the relationship undesirable. A few examples will illustrate the point:

A mother of four is living with her husband and sister. Her husband, who is a construction worker, voluntarily works only sporadically, she says, drinks heavily, and fails to support the family adequately. She says she would like to leave him, but is afraid that she cannot qualify for public assistance or other help if she does, so will stay where she is.

A mother, finding herself without food and without money, assented when a man offered to buy her \$10 worth of food and pay half the overdue rent if he could move in. He left a few weeks later, and the only source of support she can see is to find another man to move in.

The pregnant mother of children 1 and 3 years old is living entirely on the generosity of an older woman friend, who provides living space and food for the family. The friend's major (perhaps sole) source of income is the illegal sale of liquor.

A woman with six children is completely dependent on the income of her husband who deserted her several years ago and is living with another woman. The husband visits the respondent periodically to bring the family food and sometimes helps to pay the bills. The respondent says that he will not give her this help unless she will grant him sexual privileges. She is now expecting her seventh child.

In many cases the demands of poverty are met by a series of undirected, generally fortuitous, adjustments contrived on a day-to-day basis, if contrived at all. For instance, one method of dealing with the situation seems to be to define it out of existence. The definition of what constitutes a "debt," for example, places outside the realm of "real" demand money owed which is judged to be uncollectible.² Allied to this response is a myopic view of the real problems that lie ahead. One respondent told of having as her only source of income her unemployment compensation check. When she was asked what she thought she would do when it was discontinued (in 8 or 10 weeks, she thought, but was not sure) she convinced the interviewer that she simply did not know.

Another rather typical response found among the 50 families is analogous to the "borrowing from Peter to pay Paul" pattern. It is exemplified by the respondent who confronted this situation on the day of the interview; her electricity had long since been turned off, her rent was about 2 weeks' overdue, she owed another utilities bill, and she was due to make two time payments. The

² See p. 17.

previous day a man had come to turn off still another utility, she said, and she had had to pay her back bill to him in order to stop the action. She stated that this came out of the money she was trying to gather to pay the rent, and she was thus set back farther. In other words, the pattern seems to be to meet immediate demands, if possible, and to hope to be able to put the less insistent ones off temporarily. Then, when other demands increase, the hope is that the satisfied or partially satisfied ones will be pacified long enough to spread the resources around. This is not so much a matter of slowly catching up on debts, but rather permanent debt delinquency, in which a small amount of money is juggled to meet shifts in the locus of demand from time to time.

This pattern, of course, cannot always be followed. It falls when there are no resources to meet the demands, or when too many demands of the same urgency come at once. Then certain elements of the demand system may be eliminated (as when a family is evicted), and the pattern may resume with one less immediate pressure. One respondent without utilities for a year ran a wire for lighting under the wall to a neighbor's wall socket. She and her children cannot eat hot food unless they are invited to a grown daughter's home, but neither do they have pressure from utilities companies for payment.

There is also the approach of just letting things go—simply not paying the bills. This can work for a time—primarily in the early attempts to get by without public assistance. Obviously, it is a remedy which cannot be maintained for long. To illustrate, respondent No. 36 said that she and her eight children were living on \$60 usual monthly cash income. When her interview schedule was examined closely, it was found that she had in the 3 months since her termination not paid the rent or the utilities bills, and had not incurred any other new obligations.

THE LIVES OF THE RESPONDENT FAMILIES

Several specific aspects of the lives of these families were explored, including their housing, food, clothing, and medical care. For each, the respondent was asked to describe the current situation and changes which might have occurred since termination of public assistance.

Most of the families live in the type of housing frequently found to be characteristic of low-income populations, according to the comments of the interviewers. Frequent observation was made of ratholes, roach infestation, needs for structural repairs, and so forth. Although there was no systematic classification made of condition of housing, the assessments by the fieldworkers suggest that most of these dwellings would be classified as substandard.

An index of crowding (number of persons per room) showed that, by normal minimal standards, these families are somewhat overcrowded. There were an average of 1.27 persons per room. (A rate of one person per room is usually taken as the starting point for overcrowding.) However, this figure disguises some important variations from the average, such as the case of the respondent, her seven children and her sister who sleep in one room, or the mother and five children who sleep together in a room.

Among the 50 families studied, housing was not very heavily affected by termination from public assistance, as measured by whether the respondent had moved since she stopped receiving help. Only six persons (15 percent of the terminees) reported that they had moved. Of the movers, two thought they were worse off and more crowded than before, while the rest said their housing was about the same or better. Real rates of geographic mobility are undoubtedly higher among the whole group of terminated welfare cases, since the process by which our families were selected would tend to lose the

harder to find families who had moved. For example, several potential respondents on agency lists were lost to the study because they had moved and left no forwarding address. A few additional respondents said that they expected to be evicted within a short time unless they could find some money for rent.

Food seems to be a big problem, and one which was aggravated by the termination of public assistance. Only 10 people reported no food problems. Fifty-four percent of all respondents reported that they "often" have to "give up important things so that there will be enough food in the house." These "important things" include clothing, shoes, laundry soap, amenities such as cigarettes and soft drinks, as well as food for adult members of the family. Even so, 35 people said that giving up such things did not always insure sufficient food.

Surplus food has a role here. Just under half of those reporting food problems receive surplus food. The importance of this food in the eyes of the respondent ranged from "we couldn't make it without it" to "it isn't enough." A major factor aggravating the food situation was the frequent discontinuance of surplus food allotments along with the cutoff of public assistance. The respondents were almost never aware that they could reapply for it; there is widespread belief that surplus food and public assistance are part of the same program, and that ineligibility for the latter inevitably rules out the former.

In spite of these problems of providing food for the family, however, the interviewers did not uncover literal starvation. One respondent, however, said that her son was suffering from malnutrition, and several mentioned problems of frequent colds during the winter because of inadequate nourishment. One particularly dramatic case is that of the woman who had had to feed herself and her six children on nothing but oatmeal for over a month. She said that her eldest son was thin and did not eat much, because he was tired of oatmeal. There is no doubt that quantity is a problem, and that families eat on a reduced schedule. Several respondents reported, for example, that their children had gone to school that morning without breakfast, and others said that they had had to keep their children out of school at times because they had not eaten and did not receive free school lunches. But while they apparently are not in danger of death from starvation, an important characteristic of these people's food problems is that of its quality. Several people reported that they could not feed themselves or their children the diets prescribed by a doctor because the foods were too expensive, "But you eat what you can pay for."

The procedures of the study did not permit a medical assessment of the state of health of the members of these families before and after they received public assistance. How and whether changes in diet, clothing, lack of heat, anxiety, etc., materially affected their health, both in the short and long run, are not known. The respondents themselves often did not see conditions which the outside observer would consider injurious to health (e.g., a diet of potatoes, beans, and rice for the children), as constituting a health problem. Although some neglect of family health needs was reported to be associated with termination of public assistance (such as glasses for a junior high school daughter, proper diet or medicine for diabetes), 62 percent of the respondents reported no problems in health care, or at least none which were different after termination than before. One health matter that could be assessed explicitly was the availability and use of professional medical care. Free care provided for low-income families in District medical facilities did much to mitigate medical care problems for these families. A major difficulty in using these

free facilities, however, centers around the lack of carfare to visit the clinic, or to keep the clinic card current. For instance, one respondent said that, although she would be eligible for the services of a specialist to treat her daughter's physically and psychologically damaging bladder problem, the busy doctor needed to make appointments far ahead, and she was never sure of having enough carfare on the day of the appointment.

Of the 328 individuals involved in this analysis, 70 (21 percent) were said to have had at least one illness of a week or more within the past 2 years (this does not include those who suffer from chronic illnesses or who were in the hospital for delivery of a baby). There were 15 people who were reported to have had at least one bout of more or less serious mental illness during that time. Some of these required hospitalization; others seemed to be continuing problems with nerves or hypertension, often said to be associated with anxiety over money matters.

Two children died during the period asked about, one from spinal meningitis, and the other from pneumonia (said to have been due to lack of sufficient heat in the apartment during the winter). As mentioned above, five cases of malnutrition or abnormally low resistance to virus due to lack of adequate food were reported.

Many respondents described chronic disease or disability in their families, including defective vision, nervous rashes, mental retardation, diabetes, chronic anemia, heart defects, bone ailments, tuberculosis, asthma, and epilepsy. (Five of the six children of one respondent are epileptics, and she says that all but one of them have seizures more than once a month.)

Clothing problems seem to be only somewhat less acute than food problems. Clothing is one of the "important things" which respondents say they have to give up in order to have enough food in the house; indeed, it seems to be one of the first things to go. The respondents describe several consequences of this sacrifice. They are psychological as well as physical. The daughter of one respondent stayed out of school because she was ashamed to wear the same dress for a week. Lack of warm clothing and shoes in the winter seems to lead to frequent trouble with colds and winter-associated illnesses, with time lost from school and/or work.

These lacks are not only those of satisfactory clothing ("I can't buy my [17-year-old] son the clothes he needs like his friends"; "I haven't had a new dress in 2 years"; "... my [14-year-old] daughter has never had a new dress"). There was an absolute lack of adequate clothing reported by many, as well, and there were numerous cases of children being kept out of school for periods of time because of this lack.

In one sense, clothing, unlike food, is not a problem experienced as an absolute emergency by most of these people. Used clothing is acquired in several different ways and sometimes with sufficient ease to offset emergencies.

The effects of termination on the family's stability are more difficult to ascertain directly from the interview data, although some indications are available. In general, it appears that, at least in the first several months after termination, there was relatively little family disorganization which was not present before. Previous desertion of the respondent by her spouse(s) was commonly reported, and it was said that few of these spouses help in support of the family. But no single instance of desertion since termination was reported. In fact, one respondent said that one positive result of termination has been that it is now possible to have "a man in the

* Defined to include legal husbands, common-law husbands, and fathers of illegitimate children.

house" who contributes to the support of the family.

The few indicators of disorganization which did seem to be associated with termination included sending the children to Junior Village* (two cases), one high school student who dropped out to search for work, a few cases of lack of discipline among children. On the whole, however, there seemed to be rather little incidence of these kinds of problems among our particular group; however, as mentioned above, the sampling methods of the study would have tended to select the more stable families.

Respondents were asked to list their debts by type (e.g., rent, furniture) and amount due.⁵ Interestingly enough, 26 percent of the people said that they had no debts at all. This appears to be due largely to difficulties in obtaining credit because of their low-sporadic-income status. The other 72 percent of the group (one respondent did not answer the question) is in debt for a total of more than \$6,400, or an average of more than \$178 per family.

There are several things which influence the data in the direction of underestimating the indebtedness of the group. First, some respondents simply did not know how much they owed to certain of their creditors, and it was not possible to find out from other sources. Second, the definition of "debt" used in the questionnaire did not include current unpaid bills, even though the respondent stated that she would not be able to pay them. A third influence toward understatement of indebtedness is the respondent's definition of what constitutes money owed. The statements of a few respondents led to the suspicion that money is not considered as owed unless the creditor can be expected to demand it. For example, one woman listed her debts and then, when asked if there were others, stated that she owed money to a retail trade establishment, but that they did not know her current address, and she no longer considered it a debt. Just how much financial obligation is disguised by this definition is not known, but there is no doubt that this factor is operating. Thus, it is more accurate to say that the families who are in debt owe an average of at least \$178 each.

OTHER SOURCES OF INCOME

Of course, cash income is not the whole picture. Important parts of any respondent's income are in noncash forms. In order to describe accurately the lives of these people, it is necessary to examine some of the ways in which the gaps between requirements and cash income are at least partially filled.

When food is lacking, even after other requirements have been put aside, these people resort to a variety of sources, which include borrowing food from friends or relatives, begging from neighbors, or eating meals with relatives or friends. Private welfare agencies and church organizations are of help here, too, in providing food. Also, as described above, surplus food helps to close the gap.

*It should be noted that several additional respondents said that they had been advised to send their children to Junior Village, at least temporarily, but that they had refused, desiring to keep the family together as long as possible.

⁵Permission to verify the debts was requested from each respondent, but only after they had been listed. No creditors' names were written down until and unless this permission had been gotten by the interviewer. Hence, any tendency to understate or leave out debts which might have been due to fear of contact with creditors was minimized. There are factors operating to understate indebtedness (see text below), but this is not one of them.

A major difficulty in using surplus food is its inaccessibility. Many respondents reported that, although they were eligible to receive surplus food, getting it posed barriers. This was usually because of lack of carfare or because they could pick up only a portion of the allotment, since they had to carry it for as many as 40 blocks. Several people expressed a desire for some delivery system.

An additional source of help with shortages of food is the free school lunch for elementary schoolchildren. Many of the children receive lunch at school at no cost (which enables some respondents to send the children to school even though they can have no breakfast). Several respondents said that they had applied for this program, but had been rejected because the children live close enough to go home at noon, or because there was no space in the program for additional children.

Clothing comes from a wide variety of sources. Most important are friends, neighbors, and relatives. Second are inexpensive new clothing stores, followed by private welfare agencies, and second-hand clothing stores. Of all clothing sources named, 21 percent were those for new clothing, while 52 percent were for used clothing (the rest were undetermined). It appears that for most of the respondents and their children, new clothing is rarely a part of the wardrobe. (Some of the clothes received from friends and relatives are probably new, but the best guess is that most of them are hand-me-downs.)

When rent money is not available, several things can happen. A few respondents reported that their landlords had either suspended rent altogether or had allowed the rent to run in arrears over a period of time. Others reported that they had gotten emergency help from private welfare agencies, friends, or relatives in making one or two payments. One respondent's rental payments have been taken over by her sister. In the case of public housing residents, rents are reduced when a tenant goes off a public assistance status (if the tenant applies for the reduction).

Despite these leniencies, evictions do occur.⁶ Some respondents moved in with relatives for short periods of time until finding a new place to live, or were able to stay for a short while in emergency quarters provided by private agencies. Finding a new place to live presents problems not only of having rent money available, but of acceptability as a tenant. Real estate offices are reluctant to rent to unattached women with children, especially when their incomes are low and uncertain. One way around this is to have the rental made by someone who is more acceptable (e.g., an employed male). When these various techniques failed or were not applicable, one respondent and her six children spent 11 months living in cars, in a store-front church, in the home of a "wine-head" for about 2 days, and finally in the rooms of a private welfare agency. Recently, with the help of that agency, she has found living space in a semidetached house.

Needs for gas, electricity, and water are not so easily met, except by doing without. Several cases were reported of families who were living without lights or gas (telephones are almost unknown among this group). One woman whose gas had been turned off was using a hot plate to cook on. It is not always necessary to do without, however, since relatives and friends sometimes help by making payments of overdue utilities bills to prevent their being cut off.

⁶Since these cases were located by residence, they were people who managed to find a roof of some sort. Institutionalized families, squatters, and homeless derelicts would not have been located.

As discussed above, needs for medical attention are met in very large part by the provisions of free medical care. This seems to represent an important source of noncash income to these respondents.

CONCLUSION

The major role that public assistance appears to have played in the lives of these 50 families was to provide them with a rare element of financial stability in a generally unstable pattern of life. Public assistance, when they had it, did not raise them economically above a subsistence level or provide them with a new way of living. When they lost the assistance, they had more problems, but not problems of a quantitatively different nature than those with which they had been dealing before. The termination of assistance led to a series of ad hoc, impermanent solutions through which most of the families studied were thus far able to keep the children together and a roof over their heads. There was little reduction of dependency, if the term is broadly defined, but rather a shift in dependency from the public to the private sector. Though a few of the women found economically productive work, the majority had to depend on relief from private agencies or handouts from friends or relatives, on illicit activities, or on the unintended largess of the business community in permitting the accumulation of debts. The price the families paid so far was an increase in the precariousness of their stratagems for dealing with poverty and a decrease in their ability to plan their lives rationally. The data do not tell us, but one wonders what will happen to these women and their children when the limited resources of private agencies can no longer be tapped and when the possibility of debt manipulation comes to an end.

Perhaps more striking than those more or less consistent patterns that emerge among the families included in the study is the variation they display in their ability to weather the blow of welfare termination. Some of this variation can be seen in the body of the report. It comes out more clearly in a reading of the case histories which are appended. One can find in these 50 cases a family or two that appears better off than it was when getting the relief payment, the improvement not necessarily a result of welfare termination, but also not impeded by it. At the other end, one can find families apparently quite unable to cope with their situation, in danger of impaired health and of disintegration entirely as a family unit. The responses to the new situation vary from doing something (applying to a private agency, seeking a job, forming a liaison with a man who would bring in some food or a few dollars), to doing nothing (letting the bills accumulate and hoping for the best).

It would appear that the family's ability to adjust to welfare termination depends upon varying emotional and social factors as well as on the economic opportunities which their environment offers.

This study was not undertaken to help solve the District's welfare problems from the scanty data in hand. There is an implication for welfare operations, however, to be found in the varying ability of the families under study to cope with public assistance termination; the strict application of the existing eligibility rules has apparently not succeeded in separating those families who are able to go it on their own from those who are not. Even though our study concentrated on a relatively stable group of terminated cases, only a handful were able to get back to a subsistence level. Most were left worse off than before and still dependent on the community.

In the following pages, the interviews have been summarized as brief case histories.

FIFTY CASE HISTORIES

Mrs. T, a 36-year-old mother of four children was cut off assistance in June 1962 because she was said to be employable. Surplus food was also terminated at this time. She has been back to the Department twice to try to get reinstated but each time she has been told that she has "no business being on welfare." For the 10 months she was receiving public assistance, the family received \$200 a month. Since she has been on her own, her income has varied between \$150 and \$200 a month. She receives a varying amount from her husband from whom she is separated. Usually it is around \$100 a month, but it varies enough so that she is unable to count on and plan for specific amounts. She supplements this income by domestic work, which she does on an irregular, part-time basis. This, too, varies, but she estimates that her work brings in about \$25 per week. Her income in April was \$175.

Since she has been off of public assistance, Mrs. T has trouble paying the rent for her three-bedroom public housing apartment. She has kept the apartment neat and has tried to be careful of her wornout furniture, but she has no money to replace or repair old furnishings, and no money to fix the place up the way she would like to. She has also had to stop the insurance policy which she had for herself and her children which she was able to carry while she had a secure income from public assistance. Mrs. T has managed to make her food budget stretch and her four children are all receiving free lunches at school. One child stayed out of school, however, for a full week, because she was embarrassed to wear the same dress every day. Friends and the children's school have been responsible for donating what clothing the family does have.

Mrs. T was born in a large city and moved to Washington when she was 7 years old. She finished the ninth grade and was 21 years old when she had her first child. Her children range in age from 9 to 15 and she has been separated from her husband for several years.

Although her income was more dependable when she was getting public assistance, Mrs. T is relieved that she does not have to have anything more to do with welfare investigators: "When the investigators come to your house you are supposed to immediately open your door—no matter how you are dressed. This is day or night. If you are slow in letting them in, you stand a very good chance of being cut off. I have had them come to my house at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, shining flashlights all over the house, looking in closets, under the bed, everywhere * * *. Because a person is on welfare, I don't think they should have to go through things like this."

Mrs. P who is 33 years old, has lived with her four children, ages 2 to 10, in a two-bedroom public housing apartment for the past 3 years. Until September of 1962 she had been receiving \$176 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. Her assistance was reinstated in May 1963. During the 8 months in between, Mrs. P a chronic asthmatic, supported herself and her family by doing domestic work about twice a month and by finding occasional help from private welfare agencies. Her family also helped some by paying her rent.

During this period, getting enough food was often a problem, and the older children often had to give up some of their food so that the younger ones could eat better, although the two school-age children were able to get free lunches at school. The family also receives surplus food orders, which were "the only thing that kept us going" when there was no public assistance. On the day of the interview, the family had white beans and cornbread for the main meal.

Mrs. P was born on a farm and moved to Washington, D.C., when she was 10 years old; she has completed 12 years of school.

Mrs. M and her four children started receiving public assistance in New York 9 years ago after her husband was convicted of a felony and sentenced to prison. Five years ago, after her 11-year-old daughter was raped, Mrs. M decided that life would be better in Washington and she moved here. For the first year she lived here she was supported by her church. After her year's residence was up, she began receiving monthly public assistance of \$205, which she received until June 1962, at which time she was told to go find a job.

Immediately after termination of public assistance, Mrs. M found a job as a mail clerk. It is irregular full-time work. When she is needed full time, she earns as much as \$46 per week. Her job, however, is not steady, and she cannot count on the \$46. When she is laid off, she receives \$20 from a private agency. The Welfare Department located her husband at the time of termination, and he has promised to send her \$40 a month. April's income, including help from her husband, was \$150.

Mrs. M is 42 years old. She was born and grew up in New York City, where she finished 1 year of college. She had her first child when she was 25 years old.

After termination, Mrs. M sent her oldest child to live with an aunt in order to cut down on her expenses. Against her wishes, her 17-year-old son has quit school and has tried unsuccessfully to find a job to help support the family. Lately he has been associating with friends whom Mrs. M thinks are an unhealthy influence on him and he has been staying out very late at night. She feels that he is drifting away from the family and she feels her influence over him, especially when she is working full time, is limited.

Most of the family's clothing has been donated by private social agencies. The family frequently goes without food. While she was getting financial assistance, Mrs. M was also getting surplus food. Since ADC has been terminated, however, she believes, as do many others, that she is ineligible for surplus food.

One of her most serious problems is her mentally retarded child. Since she has had to be working to support her family, she has been unable to give the child the special care needed. The child attends regular school, but is five grades behind.

Mrs. M, a veteran of 9 years of public assistance, feels that the welfare program places too much emphasis on financial assistance and not enough on preparation for self-sufficiency. She would have appreciated job training. She also feels that regulations are too stringently applied, especially the man-in-the-house rule. "You don't stop being a woman just because you are on relief."

Mrs. E, 34, lives with her eight children and one grandchild in a three-room dilapidated apartment where they share a bath with other tenants. She moved to Washington 11 years ago. She has had 1 year of schooling. Mrs. E's youngest child is 6 months old, and the eldest is 15 years old. Until November 1962 the family was receiving \$216 a month from the Welfare Department. Public assistance was terminated when Mrs. E refused to stop allowing the father of her three youngest children to visit her home, because he contributes \$30 every 2 weeks to the family budget.

In addition to the \$60 a month that Mrs. E receives from her three youngest's father, the family has income from Mrs. E's part-time employment as a domestic, which varies between \$60 and \$95 a month. Even in a good month, the money income doesn't come to three-quarters of the public assistance allotment. Although she applied for reinstatement at the Department of Public Wel-

fare in February, she was refused additional help.

Mrs. E does get some help from members of her family. Her sister sometimes buys food for the family, and her mother pays for a telephone. Also, she was able to get help 1 month from a private welfare agency to pay her rent, and her surplus food allotment was recently reinstated, after it had been stopped at the same time as public assistance.

Mrs. E has had trouble supporting her family since last winter. She is 4 months in arrears in her rent, and, although her landlord has been lenient about this, she expects to be evicted before too much longer. Two days before the interview, she had had to give \$30 from her food account to the landlord. Mrs. E was also behind in her utilities bills, and expected the gas to be turned off at the end of the month.

Even though most of Mrs. E's income goes to buy food, and even though the family often has to give up important things to have enough food, about once a week they don't have enough to eat. The day of the interview, the family had no food but potatoes in the house. Mrs. E is under the impression that, because she receives surplus food, her children are not eligible for free school lunches, and she has not applied for the program.

While lack of food has not kept the children out of school, all five school-age children have missed a week or more of school at a time because they had no shoes. Mrs. E's 15-year-old daughter has also missed a good deal of school because she often had to stay home and babysit while Mrs. E was at work. However, this is no longer such a problem, because the girl dropped out of school when she had a baby 11 months ago.

Mrs. E's chronic high blood pressure, and her frequent lack of carfare, often prevent her from taking her children to receive medical care. Her 6-month-old daughter has had bronchitis since birth, her 9-year-old daughter has something wrong with her eyes, ears, and throat. These complaints usually go untreated, since Mrs. E is not always able to keep her appointments at the clinic.

Mrs. E's state of affairs is beginning to get her down. She has started taking drinks occasionally, when they are offered to her, in order to sleep at night, and several times she has left the house with the intention of not returning, so that the children could be cared for by an agency. But each time she has stayed away only 2 or 3 hours, and then returned because the children have no one but her to care for them. She feels constantly depressed and fears she is losing her mind.

Mrs. L and her four children had no income at all during March and April. There is no source of income on which she can count. In early May a private agency gave her an emergency \$10 food order.

Mrs. L, who is 25, grew up on a farm and finished 11th grade. She married when she was 19 and moved to Washington the same year. She had her first child when she was 20 and is momentarily expecting her fifth child. Mrs. L and her husband separated in 1962, and he moved to another jurisdiction. Even when they were living together, he only gave her sporadic help and only when he felt like it. He has not given her any help since February. She applied for public assistance in 1961 while she was still living with her husband, but was turned down because of the man-in-the-house rule. In November 1962, after the separation, she again applied for help and was given an emergency check for \$159. Regular cash assistance has been refused her.

Mrs. L received surplus food from October 1962 until April 1963, when she lost her eligibility because she did not have the carfare to go pick up the food and it was too far to walk.

Mrs. L owes \$159 for 3 months' back rent and \$17 for utilities. She and her four, soon to be five, children live in a minimally furnished one-bedroom apartment. The four children sleep in the one bedroom and she sleeps in the room which is used for cooking, eating, and living. She could use another bedroom, especially after the baby is born. Everyone in the family needs clothes. She has not been able to buy any since last November, when she was cut off assistance. Occasionally neighbors give her handouts, but this is nothing on which she can plan. Shoes are her greatest problem.

Her children are all preschool age and, although she would prefer working to receiving assistance, she cannot solve her child-care problems in such a way that she would have any money left over from her work after she paid for babysitters. Mrs. L has been buying food whenever anyone gives her a dollar. Nobody gives her money regularly, but when she is desperate, she manages to borrow food or money here and there.

Mrs. L realizes that her husband should be supporting her, but since he isn't, she is puzzled that the Welfare Department won't. She is bewildered by big city life. Her mother, who still lives in the town where Mrs. L grew up, is receiving assistance, and Mrs. L thinks that her mother has had an easier time than she has demonstrating that she is in need of help. Mrs. L blamed many of her present problems on living in a big city away from the rest of her family.

Mrs. F moved to Washington from Oklahoma 11 years ago. She, her children (1 to 5 years old) and her common-law husband live together in a five-room apartment. The apartment is not as satisfactory as it might be, partly because it is infested with termites, rats, and roaches. However, because her husband is satisfied with the living arrangements, and since Mrs. F has no other source of income, she doesn't feel very hopeful about being able to move.

In October 1961, Mrs. F applied for public assistance when her husband deserted her. But an investigator found the husband in the apartment during a visit, and the application was denied. Mrs. F feels that the Welfare Department was justified in the denial. Shortly after this, her husband returned to live with the family, and is usually able to provide them with about \$240 a month from his job as a truckdriver. She had not asked for help from any private welfare agencies, nor has she sought aid from her relatives in Oklahoma.

The family has difficulty finding enough food once in a while. Even when they do give up important things to have enough food, it isn't always successful. When they do eat, the food is cooked on a hotplate since the gas has been disconnected. Clothing is often a problem, and Mrs. F has to rely on the generosity of friends who give her used clothing. She sometimes has to beg them or her husband for money to buy shoes. With the exception of her husband's "hypertension," Mrs. F's family seems to enjoy good health most of the time.

Mrs. F has no bills besides the one for gas, because she cannot obtain credit anywhere.

Mrs. F, who is 30 years old, wants to leave Washington and return with her children to her family in Oklahoma. She says she is unhappy having to depend on her husband, who she fears is likely to desert her again, leaving her destitute.

Mrs. T had an April income of \$50 for her family of five. In addition to this, her monthly rent of \$33 was paid by her uncle, who has been paying it since her public assistance was cut off in September.

Until assistance was terminated in September, Mrs. T had, for 2½ years, received monthly public assistance of \$132. She says she always had enough food while she was receiving assistance, but now she runs out about twice a week and has to borrow from her neighbors.

She was told last September that she must find and bring the father of her baby down to the Welfare Department and have him sign a support statement. She has not seen this man for over 2 years and although she has looked, she has been unable to find him. She applied for reinstatement in December and again in March, but was refused help because she had not yet located the baby's father.

Mrs. T, who is 27, grew up in a small town where she finished 10th grade. When she was 16, she moved to Washington. She was 17 when she had her first child. Her children range in age from 17 months to 10 years. For the past 2 years, she has been living in a minimally furnished, but well-maintained three-bedroom public housing unit.

Mrs. T has continued to receive surplus food since financial assistance was cut off. But even with surplus food and free lunches for her two school-age children, she does not have enough food or enough money to keep her family from going hungry. She reports that her two older children frequently have to be kept home from school because there has been no food for breakfast.

The family has not bought any clothing since September. She is given secondhand clothes by her neighbors for the two younger children, but the older school-age children are in critical need of clothes and she has no source of supply of secondhand clothes for them. They had to stay home from school during the coldest part of the winter because they had no warm clothes and no boots.

Mrs. T has not tried to find a job because she cannot make adequate child-care arrangements which would not cost her as much as she earned. She hopes that her uncle and her mother will go on paying her rent until she gets reestablished with the Welfare Department. In the meantime, she must convince the Department that her continued search for her baby's father is fruitless.

Mrs. J, a 49-year-old native of Washington, lives with her 15-year-old son, her 18-year-old daughter, the daughter's 15-month-old daughter, and the five children of another daughter, ranging from 8 months to 8 years, in a three room apartment.

Several years ago, Mrs. J took over the responsibility of the care of her daughter's children, gathering them from different foster homes. She was receiving \$209 a month public assistance until February 1963, paid to her because the daughter was too young to care adequately for the children. In February, the daughter was judged to be able to support the children herself, and assistance was terminated. The children's mother has not taken over their full care, and they still live with Mrs. J.

Mrs. J depends on her grown children for all of her income. She receives \$60 a month from her daughter, who is employed as a cleaner in a hospital, as well as weekly food contributions. A grown son is also able to help sometimes.

Mrs. J's surplus food allotment was discontinued in February, but she says she doesn't have too much trouble getting enough food most of the time, what with her daughter's help and the generosity of a local grocer, who has let her run up a grocery bill of \$120. None of the three school-age children in the household receives free lunches at school. Mrs. J has also been able to keep from running behind on her \$65 rent.

The family sometimes has trouble getting enough adequate clothing to wear, particularly in wet or cold weather. The children have had to stay home from school a day or two on occasion during the winter because their shoes had worn thin. Aside from winter coats, which Mrs. J feels are more frequent because of lack of warm clothing, the

family has not had any medical trouble recently.

Mrs. P's March income for her family of seven was \$65. This was larger than usual because her brother gave her \$20 for rent. She received \$15 emergency financial aid from a private agency. The remaining \$30 came from the father of her three oldest children. This \$30 is the only monthly income upon which she can count.

Mrs. P, who is 25, grew up in a small town and finished ninth grade. She began living with her common law husband when she was 15 and had her first child. She separated from him 5 years ago and 3 years ago she moved to the District. She began living with the father of her three youngest children in 1959, but he left her and went to another State when she was pregnant with her youngest child. In October 1961 she began receiving public assistance of \$191 per month. In November 1962, the father of the three youngest children came back to pay his one and only visit. During the course of this half-hour visit, a Welfare Department investigator arrived and found him in her living room. The father promised the investigator that he would support the children and agreed to come around to the Department to sign a support agreement, but he again disappeared. Mrs. P has never seen him again nor has she received any help from him. In December, Mrs. P was told by her caseworker that assistance to her would be discontinued unless she could produce the man for an interview. When she said she wouldn't know where to look, she was told that it was up to her to find him and that the Welfare Department had to stick by its regulations. Mrs. P's assistance ended in December. She has been looking for the father of these three children since December, but has exhausted all her leads and has had no success in finding him.

In order to support her family when assistance was terminated, she immediately took a job as a domestic. She took her 10-year-old daughter out of school to care for the three young children and her mother while she was working. At the end of January, because she had inadequate clothing, Mrs. P caught the flu and lost her job. Since then she has only been able to find work 1 day every other week and on the days she works, the 10-year-old daughter stays home to care for the family. Mrs. P is reluctant to have this child miss school, but other babysitting arrangements are not as satisfactory and she must bring in some income.

She owes \$126 in back rent for February and March and, since she could not pay in April, she was evicted. Her new apartment consists of a kitchen and one room in which seven people eat and sleep. The family shares a bath with others. Mrs. P says this apartment is worse and more crowded than the one from which she was evicted.

Since January, Mrs. P has received two monthly food orders from a private agency. Although she has been eligible for surplus food since February, she has lacked the fare to get her full allotment. She has been carrying about one-third of what the family is allowed on the 25-minute walk from the center to her house. Mrs. P says she runs completely out of food about twice a month and her two older children frequently go to school without any breakfast. These two children do get free lunches at school and so she feeds breakfast only to her younger children and her mother when she is short.

Mrs. P has bought no clothing in the last 5 months and she has no money to wash the clothes she has. She has had to keep the children out of school because they had no clean clothes and she lacked the money for a bar of soap. "Before I was cut off assistance, I washed three tubs of clothing a week and also used the dryer. I spent \$1.80 a week for the washer and dryer and

65 cents for detergent. Since February, I have only been able to wash by hand and only the most necessary things. I have three trash cans and several boxes of dirty clothes in our room, which I intend to wash when I get my public assistance check again."

In addition to the \$126 Mrs. P owes in back rent, she owes \$35 to her aunt. She is trying to get back on public assistance because she has exhausted her search for the father of her three youngest children and she is now in "a miserable position." She cannot expect her brother to go on paying her rent. Her mother, who has had a stroke, has diabetes, and failing eyesight, needs medical attention which she cannot get for lack of carfare.

Mrs. W lived the early part of her life in a small town. Following her graduation from high school, she moved to the District of Columbia where she has resided for the past 19 years. Now 35 years old, Mrs. W has seven children, six of whom live with her in a sparsely furnished apartment. Her oldest son, 17, lives with her brother. She is expecting another child in July.

Mrs. W received public assistance from 1961 to July 1962. Her need of assistance arose from the fact that she was deserted by her husband in 1959. According to the respondent, her welfare grant was terminated because of her latest pregnancy; she does not resent the discontinuation of her grant: "I think it was fair in a way * * * when they cut me off after I got pregnant."

The grant which Mrs. W received as a welfare recipient amounted to \$203 per month. She also received a parcel of surplus food every other week. Since her welfare payments were stopped, some of the family's monthly bills have been paid by the husband, but there is rarely any ready cash. Mrs. W now has debts amounting to \$219.50, including \$162.50 for 2 months' rent. She believes that she and her children will be evicted unless the rent is paid quickly. The husband, who has been living with another woman for some time now, also brings food into the apartment on occasion, but these donations are sporadic and inadequate. Mrs. W finds it necessary to solicit extra food from her neighbors and from her church, but there is still almost never enough. Three of the children get free lunches at school; the other school-age child is "too embarrassed" to accept them. The school, neighbors, and relatives are also sources of secondhand clothing. It is hard to find shoes, however, and the lack of shoes has sometimes kept the children home from school. Mrs. W's own wardrobe consists of two dresses.

Two of the children suffer from chronic disorders, but medical care for the family has been suspended since last summer. Mrs. W herself is anemic and indicates that she has had no prenatal care. She expressed the hope that she might undergo a sterilization operation following her forthcoming delivery.

Mrs. S is separated from her husband. She lives with her five younger children in a two-room apartment consisting of bathroom, kitchen, and one room that serves as a living room-bedroom. The family sleeps on one bed and one cot. There is no bathtub and no stove. The gas and electricity have been turned off for several months because Mrs. S is unable to pay the utility companies.

Mrs. S is a woman of 43 who finished 1 year of college. She came to Washington 12 years ago with her husband. Since they have been separated, he has returned to the small town in which they both grew up.

Mrs. S received public assistance from 1959 until early in 1961, when the Welfare Department deemed her employable and told her husband, who is an alcoholic, to support the family. At this time, she had already separated from her husband and her youngest child was only 4 years old. When her welfare checks ceased, Mrs. S moved to

her present apartment for which she pays \$65 a month, including utilities. She is more crowded than she was before, but the rent is lower. Her husband is supposed to be paying her \$40 per week in support. Up until the time of the interview he had only paid her \$34 for the entire year.

Until January of this year, Mrs. S was employed as a fountain clerk, earning \$30 per week, out of which she had babysitter costs in addition to rent, food, utilities, and clothes. Since she lost her job she has been receiving unemployment compensation of \$108 per month. She has another few weeks to go on this. In April, a private agency helped her substantially by paying her rent for her. When she was evicted from her former apartment, Mrs. S had to leave her furniture behind. Although she still owes the furniture company for it, she does not intend to pay for it. Her present apartment is furnished with one bed, one cot, three chairs, and a table. She is dependent on one of her married daughters for the children's clothes and even though the children feel ashamed that they do not have new clothes and that their clothes are shabby, she says that they love school so much that they would never stay home. They do not receive free lunches at school and due to a mixup, Mrs. S has not been able to receive surplus food. She hopes that everything will be straightened out so that she can begin receiving it again.

Since assistance has been terminated, the family has regularly gone without food, clothing, lights, and hot food. In the winter, they went for long periods of time with no heat. One daughter suffers from asthma, which requires frequent medical attention for which Mrs. S sometimes does not have the carfare, although she is entitled to free care. Mrs. S suffers from a nervous rash, which is under treatment, as well as an infected arm.

When her unemployment runs out, she does not know what she will do. She would like to work, but can only find jobs which pay her about \$30 per week. Out of this she cannot afford adequate child care and she is unwilling to let her children roam the streets of her neighborhood, which she thinks is an undesirable one.

In March, Mrs. H and her five children had an income of \$35, which was mostly from family. April's income up until the time of the interview on the 26th, had been \$15 and a pair of shoes from a private social agency. Emergency assistance was refused her at three other private agencies. When there are enough clothes, two of her children can go to school and get free lunches. Her 5-year-old child has not yet started school because there are not enough clothes for him. Mrs. H hopes she will receive enough clothing handouts by next September to send this child to first grade.

This summer Mrs. H will have her sixth child and her 17-year-old daughter will have her first. If she can manage to pay \$53 she owes in back rent and to keep current, eight people will be living in a three-bedroom public housing unit, which is minimally furnished and poorly kept up. The father of Mrs. H's baby who lives in another State does not know that she is pregnant and she does not expect that he will give her any help. The father of her daughter's child has promised to support it but has no plans for moving her and the child out of Mrs. H's apartment.

Mrs. H, who is 34, was born on a farm and completed 4 years of school. She has lived in the District since 1954. She began living with her common law husband when she had her first child at 17. She lived with him for 12 years. In 1958, when she was 29 and pregnant with her fifth child, he deserted her. She has not heard from him since and she does not know his whereabouts. At the time her fifth child was born, she began to receive monthly public assistance of \$209.

Mrs. H's welfare payments were terminated in October when an investigator reported that she was employed. At that time, Mrs. H was working without pay for a friend of her brother in order to repay a debt to him. When assistance stopped, Mrs. H said, "When I had no money and my relatives had left the city, I went to Junior Village to try to get my children in. They wouldn't take them and I cried."

Mrs. H has had clothing, food, and occasional money handouts from her family since October. Her brother's friend, for whom she was working also helped. Now her family and her brother's friend have all moved away and she has been unable to pay the rent for her five-room public housing apartment since March. She has received an eviction notice and she owes \$225 for rent, food, and utilities. On the day of the interview, the refrigerator had only a bottle of water in it and there was no food in the house. She has applied for reinstatement with the Welfare Department and is expecting an investigator any day.

Mrs. H said, "I don't understand it. When I really need help I cannot get it. Junior Village would not even take my children when I had to face eviction before." If she can't get an extension of rent credit this time and if she does not get back on public assistance she will have to try again to get Junior Village to take her children.

Mrs. N pays \$75 a month for her five-room apartment where she lives with her 23-year-old grandson and her 45-year-old mentally retarded son, for whom she must care. April's income for this family was \$100, which was more than usual; \$40 came from her grandson who works seasonally as a construction worker and \$60 from social security. Mrs. N is 74 years old and in good health, but her son requires attention and has great difficulty in finding employment.

Mrs. N first applied for public assistance in 1956 when her husband died. She was rejected because the Welfare Department told her that her eight adult children should support her. This they have never been able to do because they have their own families to care for. In 1962 she again applied for assistance but was told by the Welfare Department that her \$60 social security check was sufficient for her own needs and the needs of her mentally retarded son.

Mrs. N has been threatened with eviction but was helped by a church group with money toward her rent. This group also gives her carfare so that she may go to the distribution center and get her surplus food. Her rent is \$75 per month, and she is 3 months in arrears in paying it. Utilities are not included in the rent, and she has been without heat for several months. She owes \$72 in utility bills. Clothing is donated by the same church group that helped her with her rent and gives her carfare to get surplus food.

Mrs. N came to Washington from a small southern town 19 years ago with her husband, to whom she was married for over 50 years. Since his death several years ago, she has been dependent on her social security check and the occasional employment of her son and grandson. Her son would like to work and has, in the past, worked. But finding a job is difficult and he has been looking for one unsuccessfully for the past 9 months. Mrs. N still hopes that the Welfare Department will give her aid, since \$60 is insufficient income to support both her and her son.

Mrs. K, who is 33, was born in Washington, where she finished 9 years of school. Shortly after she left school, her first child was born. She now has seven children, ranging in age from 18 months to 16 years. Six of the children, all boys, live with her in her four-room public housing apartment. Mrs. K has sent her 18-month-old daughter to live with a relative, because she isn't able to provide enough food, clothing, or care for the baby.

The family usually has about \$120 income each month. Half of this comes from Mrs. K's estranged husband, and the rest from the father of her two youngest sons. Mrs. K is doing just about as well in terms of money income as she was when she was receiving public assistance, which was terminated in December 1961. But her surplus food allotment was stopped at the same time, and the family often has to give up clothing and let the bills go in order to have enough to eat.

Mrs. K has a few debts, for clothing and groceries, but has managed to keep her rent and utilities bills paid up.

Both Mrs. K and her 2-year-old son suffer from chronic asthma, and Mrs. K also suffers from a nervous condition. Otherwise, the family is usually in good health.

Although Mrs. K has tried twice to get help from private agencies, she has been unsuccessful. She must rely entirely on the support of the fathers of her children and the generosity of her sister-in-law.

Mrs. H, who is a 38-year-old mother of four children, was refused public assistance because she was deemed employable. Mrs. H reported that, at the time of an interview with the Welfare Department 4 years ago, it was " * * * embarrassing and heartbreaking to be in need and to have to go to these people. They talk to you as if you were dirt and as if whatever they have to do for you comes out of their own pockets." Her more recent interviews, in applying for retraining, were more polite. Mrs. H does not like to be dependent, but her husband, who is the father of her two older children, has been in prison for the past 5 years and the father of her two younger children gives her \$80 per month for their support.

Until last January, Mrs. H supported her family by working the night shift as a nurse's aid. For this she received \$130 every 2 weeks and, because she sews everyone's clothes, the family got along. Last January, however, she had an accident while she was on the job. While she was under medical attention for the accident, she discovered that she had a heart condition and the doctors told her that she should not be doing such strenuous work.

Since January she has not worked and has fallen in debt. She owes a total of \$438. She is 3 months behind in her rent, which is \$100 per month. Her gas bill is \$99 and the gas has been turned off for the past 2 months. Mrs. H has pawned some jewelry and cashed two savings bonds since January in order to buy food. She has applied for surplus food but has not yet received it. Private agencies have given her emergency relief but her main hope lies in being accepted for the rehabilitation program so that she may find less strenuous work and once again become self-sufficient.

Mrs. C and her four children live in a five-room apartment on the second floor of a rat- and roach-ridden dilapidated building. The children range from 3 to 8 years old.

Mrs. C applied for public assistance after her husband left her to live with another woman, but was told she was ineligible. She sent three of the children to be cared for by her mother in another State for a year, because she was unable to do so herself. In the meantime, she found a job in a restaurant, and took her husband to court to arrange for some financial help from him.

After she brought the children back to live with her in Washington, Mrs. C suffered a slipped disk on the job. She had to quit working and spend much of her time in bed. She tried to go back to work as a counter girl, but had to give it up 3 weeks ago because of the constant pain in her back. She went to a doctor for treatment, and he gave her a prescription for relief of the pain, but Mrs. C could not afford to buy the medicine, and has not been back to the doctor, because she can't pay him.

Now Mrs. C depends on the \$80 a month from her husband, and whatever occasional

help she can get from friends. She is hoping for a settlement from workmen's compensation soon, but isn't sure what the current status of the claim is.

While the C family is waiting for some more stable source of income, they are having a hard time getting enough to eat and wear. They frequently run out of food, and Mrs. C believes that surplus food is available only to public assistance recipients. Neither of the school-age children get free lunches at school.

The C's sometimes have to give up things in order to have enough clothing, although Mrs. C has had the occasional help of her sister and a friend, and rarely has to buy used clothes. But Mrs. C's 8-year-old daughter missed 2 weeks of school last winter because she didn't have enough warm clothing and shoes.

Mrs. C is 26 years old, and moved to the District 5 years ago. She grew up in a small town, where she had 10 years of school.

Mrs. H and her four children, aged 2 to 7 years, her mother, four brothers and two sisters, live in a rundown row house with six rooms. Mrs. H and her children all sleep in one room. Mrs. H was receiving public assistance until May 1962, when investigators found the father of her youngest daughter visiting. Although he said that he was not living there, Mrs. H was not successful in preventing termination of her welfare grant.

Mrs. H is able to bring in about \$60 a month by doing babysitting at home for a neighbor. Two of her brothers are old enough to hold jobs, one as a newspaper deliverer, and the other as a window washer, and her mother receives social security payments. Mrs. H gets only sporadic help from the father of her 4-year-old daughter.

Although Mrs. H receives surplus food, they often run out, and Mrs. H's mother must buy most of the food for the family, which eats together. When they run short, Mrs. H goes without in order to give the children more. Mrs. H is dependent on her mother and her aunt to buy clothing for herself and the children. Most of the clothing they can buy is used. Her school-age son has had to stay out of school sometimes because he did not have any shoes. Mrs. H did get a slip for clothing from a visiting nurse, but lost it.

The family has not had severe health problems recently although the children frequently catch cold for lack of warm clothing. Mrs. H's 9-month-old son died of spinal meningitis last summer.

Mrs. H has debts amounting to \$195 for furniture, appliances, and clothing. The rent and utilities are taken care of by her mother and older brothers. Mrs. H is concerned that she may have to move into a place of her own, because building inspectors who visited recently said that repairs to the walls, floors, and ceilings of the house would have to be made or the building would be condemned.

Mrs. C and her 3- and 1-year-old children are being supported by her landlady who gives them, out of sympathy, one room in her house. Mrs. C is expecting her third child this summer. Mrs. C's landlady is un dependable in her support, however; occasionally she gets drunk and locks Mrs. C and her children out and refuses to give them any food. When this happens, Mrs. C has to go begging in the neighborhood for food and shelter. Mrs. C and her children frequently have to go without food and they are dependent on Mrs. C's sister for hand-me-down clothes.

Mrs. C was born in Washington into a family of seven girls deserted by the father. She finished ninth grade. She is now 20 and she had her first child when she was 17. Three different fathers have been involved in her three pregnancies. She has twice been refused help at the Welfare Department be-

cause she cannot locate two of the fathers and the other one refuses to come to the Department and agree to support her.

Although some of Mrs. C's needs are being met by her landlady's generosity, they are being met on a noncash basis and it is not possible to calculate the amount.

She has been living in her present room for the last 2 months. The landlady, when sober, has been extremely kind to her, even giving her money for carfare so that she can get prenatal care. The landlady's drinking, however, makes Mrs. C's source of support capricious. She owes no money because neither credit nor money is available to her; she has no income whatsoever.

Six months ago Mrs. L and her five children, the oldest 11 years old, moved into their two-room apartment; they share a bath and are able to use the kitchen downstairs. Not long after the family moved, a sixth child was born. Things get pretty crowded for the family—the four daughters sleep in one bed, and Mrs. L takes her two sons in with her. She has applied for public housing but hasn't heard yet whether she can move in.

Mrs. L was receiving \$151 a month from the Welfare until March 1963. Since the aid was terminated, she has had to rely almost entirely on private welfare agencies, family, and friends for her support. Mrs. L's mother has helped with food occasionally. Her brother can sometimes help, too, but he has a family of his own to support. Mrs. L sometimes has trouble getting enough food, and has to give up such things as clothing, haircuts, and cigarettes then. The family gets surplus food regularly, but even with that and the help from Mrs. L's mother, they are often short of food. The four schoolchildren don't eat breakfast, but rely on their free lunches at school. On the day of the interview, there was no food in the house. Mrs. L's 3-year-old son asked for a sandwich, but there was no bread, and no money to buy it with. Mrs. L has gotten help with cash and food from three private agencies since her termination.

Occasionally, the L children have had to stay out of school because they didn't have enough clothing to wear. Most of the family's clothing comes from a private welfare agency and is used.

Mrs. L thinks that so far things have not been too much different than they were when she was receiving public assistance, except that her food problems have been aggravated. However, she has not paid her rent since her termination, and owes a \$46 utilities bill. As soon as Mrs. L can find someone to care for her children, she plans to look for a job. Mrs. L was born in the District 28 years ago, and finished 8 years of school.

Since October, when assistance was cut off and her husband ordered to support her family, Mrs. H has not known how much real income her family has. Mr. H was ordered by the Welfare Department to give his wife and 11 children \$46 per week. Mr. H agreed only on condition that he be allowed to move back in with his family from whom he had been separated for 2 years. His return to the family has represented real hardship for all of them: the children dislike him and have been made extremely upset by his presence in the home. When he drinks, which is frequent, Mr. H beats up his wife. This spring she spent 1 month in St. Elizabeths for a mental disorder which she attributes directly to the strain of living with her husband.

Although Mr. H is supposed to pay her \$46 per week, Mrs. H thinks that he gives her considerably less. He pays the rent and buys food daily, not what she asks for but what he thinks the family ought to have. Occasionally he gives her \$2 or \$3, but this is all she sees each month.

The family has grown used to eating no breakfasts. All 11 children are school age

and receive free lunches. Dinners lack variety, but they seldom go without dinner. Mrs. H still gets surplus food.

Mrs. H, who is now 37, grew up in Washington where she finished seventh grade. She married her husband when he was about 17. A year later she had her first child. Her husband is the father of all 11 children. Mr. and Mrs. H separated in June 1960. The strain of living with him had caused Mrs. H to seek psychiatric help since 1957, which she still continues to need. She has had to have periodic institutionalization for her nervous disorders, most of which she blames on him.

In June 1960, when she first separated from her husband, Mrs. H had to put her children in Junior Village. She managed to take them out again at the end of July. In September of 1960 she was evicted from her public housing apartment for nonpayment of rent and she was forced to put the children in Junior Village again, this time until March 1961.

During the 2 years she was separated from her husband, Mrs. H received assistance from private agencies and from the Welfare Department. All of this aid was of an emergency type: from January until October of 1962, for example, her welfare payments varied between \$199 and \$36. From month to month she had no certain sum upon which she could rely and base her family budget.

The family is now living in a substandard six-room apartment in which the stove, the refrigerator, and the lights have been turned off because they owe \$150 in back utilities. Mrs. H must go next door in order to cook and use her neighbor's refrigerator. Mrs. H never knows from one day to the next whether or not her husband will pay their bills.

Most of the children's clothes are left over from their last stay at Junior Village. Occasionally neighbors and relatives give them hand-me-downs. At times the children have had to stay home from school because of lack of shoes, and shoes have always been a problem for this family. The H family's poverty has been exacerbated by the tension between the husband and wife and the father and children. According to Mrs. H, the older girls have become upset by their father's return home; they have lost their jobs and they dislike asking him for carfare so that they can look for new jobs.

Mrs. H would definitely prefer living apart from her husband but public assistance has been refused her and he will not support her unless he lives with his family. She is too nervous, and has been for the past 5 years, to hold down a job herself.

Mrs. K was born in Washington 40 years ago, and has lived here all her life. She has had eight children, the first born when she was about 20, about 2 years after she left school. Five of the children, ages 2 to 10, still live at home with Mrs. K and her common-law husband. The family of seven has lived for 2 years in two rooms on the second floor of a dilapidated building where the stairs are broken, the halls are unlighted, and most of the plaster has fallen off the walls. They share a bath with other tenants. Mrs. K's other three children, who are 20, 17, and 15, have lived with an aunt for the last 2 years because there is not enough room for them at home.

Things are pretty hard for Mrs. K much of the time; she has a full-time job as a domestic, but it only brings in \$28 a week. Her husband works part time and irregularly as a caddie. If he has a good month, the family may have as much as \$300 to spend. When things are not so good, Mrs. K can sometimes get help from her children's aunt and from her 20-year-old son. Otherwise, she often has to beg friends and neighbors for food and clothing for the children. The three schoolchildren do not get free lunches.

Although she is glad to have a job that brings in at least some money regularly, Mrs.

K worries about the effects of this on the children. She must work in the evenings, and, although her husband is supposed to care for the children, he can't always be counted on. He sometimes disappears for as much as a week at a time. When this happens, the children must be cared for by Mrs. K's 10-year-old daughter.

Mrs. K was receiving about \$160 each month from the Public Welfare until May 1962, when her caseworker, on the only visit to the home, chanced on Mrs. K's husband as he was visiting to bring the family some money. She has not been back to Welfare to ask for reinstatement. At one point, when she needed money to pay her rent, Mrs. K sought help from a private welfare agency, but was turned down. She was able to get an advance on her wages from her employer, but this, of course, only led later on to food shortages.

Mrs. D is expecting her seventh child in September. She lives in two rooms of substandard housing with her six children who range in age from 11 months to 9 years. From March until June 1962 she received \$223 a month in public assistance. She continues to receive surplus food, but she says it is inadequate to keep her family from being hungry almost constantly. Public assistance was terminated at the time her sixth child was born because the father of this child would not sign an affidavit of inability to support her.

Since assistance was terminated, Mrs. D has been receiving \$28 per month from the father of her third, fourth, and fifth children. Her total income for April was \$140. She would not tell the interviewer what the main source of her income was.

Mrs. D is 28 years old. She has lived in the District all her life. She finished ninth grade and had her first child when she was 19 years old. She is separated from her husband.

Mrs. D was evicted from her former apartment in September because she could not pay the rent. At present she owes \$74 to the gas company and the gas has been turned off for about 3 months. She has been cooking and heating water for baths on a hotplate. At the time of the interview two of her children were in the hospital severely burned from an overturned pot of hot water which was heating on the hotplate. During the winter one child was hospitalized with pneumonia, which Mrs. D believes was caused by the coldness of the apartment. The entire family suffers from frequent colds because of lack of heat and poor nutrition. The children do not get free lunches at school. Clothing is handed down from child to child, with occasional handouts of used clothing from neighbors and relatives. Mrs. D has not been able to buy any clothing for the family for a year, since termination of assistance. During the winter, the children were frequently kept home from school because of inadequate clothing. Mrs. D had to wear rubber boots with no shoes inside them during the coldest part of the winter.

Mrs. J, a 31-year-old native of Washington, lives with her 11 children, her sister, her sister's son, and her mother in a six-room row house which, though rundown, is basically in fairly good shape. Things get pretty crowded in the house, and as many as five children must sleep in one bed, but Mrs. J has nowhere else to go since she and her husband were separated. The family gets along on the earnings of Mrs. J's mother, a domestic, and occasional contributions from Mr. J. When everything goes well, these sources bring in about \$270 a month. Mrs. J has no money to give her children, who are from 1 to 15 years old, but some of them earn pennies by selling wine bottles and rags. Mrs. J used to contribute \$30 a month toward the rent, which is paid by her mother, but she hasn't been able to do this since her public assistance was terminated.

Mrs. J had been receiving \$250 a month in public assistance, but this was discontinued in August 1962 which her husband failed to turn up for an interview at the Department of Public Welfare. Since then, she has applied for reinstatement, but was told that she was not eligible, again because her husband did not come in. She is frustrated and discouraged because she has no control over her husband. And her caseworker doesn't seem to be influenced by being told that Mrs. J's children are hungry.

Getting enough food for the family is often a problem, especially since Mrs. J's surplus food allotment was terminated at the same time as her public assistance. Six of the school-age children get free lunches at school, but the 15-year-old son does not, and he sometimes has to stay home from school if Mrs. J has no money to pay for his lunch.

Although she had no clothing or food problems when she was receiving public assistance, Mrs. J must now take money which might go for clothes in order to buy food. Even though she can occasionally afford to buy clothes at a rummage sale, at least one child has to stay out of school just about every week for lack of clothes or shoes, since almost all of her husband's \$35 a week (when it comes) goes for food.

Mrs. J is worried because she can't afford to take the children to the clinic when they need to go. The boys sometimes cut themselves on the wine bottles they gather and need stitches, and the 1-year-old daughter has had a discharge from her ear for 2 weeks, but Mrs. J can't get them to the doctor because she has no carfare.

Mrs. J has become depressed and discouraged by her state of affairs and just doesn't feel like doing anything. She used to enjoy dressing and sending the children off to school and keeping tabs on them. Now the children are pretty much on their own, and the older boys have been getting into trouble for petty theft since Mrs. J stopped giving them money. She feels that the family is disintegrating, but doesn't know what to do about it.

Mrs. R lives with her eight children in a five-room substandard house, which is infested with rats and roaches. The children range in age from 4 months to 12 years. From 1958 until September 1962 she received \$198 in monthly public assistance plus surplus food. Assistance was terminated when she became pregnant with her eighth child. In January after the child was born, she re-applied for assistance and was accepted. In March, several welfare investigators came to her home at a time when the father of the three youngest children had come on a visit to bring food. Although the investigators were told that the sole purpose of the visit was to see his children and to bring them food, Mrs. R's assistance was again terminated on the grounds that she had violated the man-in-the-house rule.

Since termination of public assistance Mrs. R's cash income has been \$60 per month, given her by the father of her three youngest children. She has had to leave unpaid her rent and utility bills and at the time of the interview had been given 2 days to pay her rent or face eviction. Gas and electricity have been turned off for 2 months. Her sister has helped her by paying 1 month's rent and she is hopeful that her sister can come up with the rent money again and save her from eviction.

Mrs. R is 27 years old. She was born on a farm and came to the District when she was 19 years old. She dropped out of school after the sixth grade and had her first child when she was 15 years old.

Most of the children's clothing comes from private social agencies, from teachers, and from neighbors. The children lack adequate and sufficient clothing and have, at times, had to stay home from school. The family

never eats breakfast in order to cut down on food bills. The four older children get free lunches at school.

Her only constant source of income is the \$60 she receives from the father of her three younger children. On this income, debts are beginning to pile up and the family does not have enough money to feed or clothe itself.

When 24-year-old Mrs. P's public assistance was terminated, she didn't need it any more—her husband had returned from the mental hospital and was able to go back to his job as a porter. Now the P's don't have to rely on anyone else for help, which is just as well, since Mr. P doesn't like to have to do this. Mr. and Mrs. P have about \$300 a month to support themselves and their five children, whose ages range between 10 months and 7 years.

The P's live in five rooms on the first floor of an alley dwelling on a one-block street. They have problems with rats, and the plumbing doesn't always work right. They have applied for public housing, but will have to stay where they are unless the application is accepted because they can't afford more rent than they now pay.

Food and clothing don't often pose problems for the P family. They are able to buy enough potatoes, beans, and rice to fill up on, and they haven't had to ask for reinstatement in the surplus food program, which was terminated at the same time as public assistance. And although the children's clothing is worn, it is suitable for school wear. Except for Mr. P's 3 months in the hospital, the family has not had any health problems. Mrs. P is able to take the children for free medical attention to the run-of-the-mill diseases of the children, and she herself is in good health.

Mrs. I lives with her seven children in a six-room, substandard framehouse. Also, sharing the house are her mother and father, 4 brothers, 2 sisters, and 3 nieces—or a total of 19 people. Mrs. I sleeps in one room with her seven children and one of her sisters. She has lived in this crowded house for 6 years. Mrs. I received monthly public assistance of \$129 from 1957 until January 1963, when it was reported to her caseworker that she had been seen with one of the fathers of her children. During this period, she also received support payments from one of the fathers of \$34 monthly. She continues to receive three bags of surplus food a month. During the time she was receiving assistance, her total monthly income was \$163.

Since termination she has been working part time as a kitchen helper in a drugstore, earning \$25 per week. She was only able to start this job in April, however, because in February she had her seventh child. In April, when she worked at her job, her income was \$138, including her \$34 support payment. Her father and one brother work irregularly as day laborers, earning, when they are able to find work, \$12 per day. The salaries from these irregularly employed 3 people are used to support the 19 people in the household.

Although they receive surplus food, the family frequently goes without meals. The four school-age children receive free lunches at school. They are dependent on private social agencies for clothing handouts.

One of the children has an endocrine disturbance which requires medical attention. Mrs. I frequently lacks the carfare to take this child to clinic. More serious, however, is her father's heart condition, which he is afraid to report to his employer for fear of losing his job.

Mrs. I is 25 years old. She has lived in the District all her life. She finished 8 years of school and had her first child when she was 14 years old. She has been separated from her husband, who is the father of her two oldest children, since she was 17 years old.

Mrs. R and her children have lived with her parents, her sister, and her grandmother

since her husband deserted her about 3 years ago. The family lives in an eight-room brick row house.

Mrs. R has six children between 1 month and 8 years of age. Only five of them live with her, though, since her 6-year-old is in a TB sanatorium in another State.

Mrs. R received public assistance from the time her husband deserted her until February 1963, when her youngest child was born. The father of the youngest, who has never seen the baby, refuses to go to the welfare for an interview, and gave Mrs. R an incorrect address from which mail is consistently returned undelivered. Since she stopped receiving public assistance, Mrs. R is completely dependent on the earnings of her father, a construction worker, and her mother, a domestic, although her grandmother's Aid to the Disabled check helps also. Mrs. R herself had no money income in March, which is the usual state of affairs.

Mrs. R has trouble getting enough food for her baby, and often has to beg money from friends and neighbors to buy milk for the children. Although she receives surplus food, Mrs. R must walk the 20 blocks each way to get it, since she lacks carfare. The school-age daughter receives free lunch at school when a regular recipient is absent, but lives too close to home to get it regularly. Although some of Mrs. R's friends and her mother's employer help out with used clothing, the baby has nothing to wear, and the other children's clothing is ragged and dirty.

Mrs. R's family has been plagued with health problems. Although Mrs. R herself is usually in good health, her 3-year-old daughter was in the hospital with TB for a year, and her 6-year-old son is presently there for the same reason. Her 8-year-old daughter is in need of glasses, and her 15-month-old son should have surgery to correct a defective eye muscle. Her grandmother recently returned from 5 months in the hospital with a cardiac disorder.

Mrs. R is planning to file a nonsupport action against the father of her youngest child, but is discouraged in general about her situation, and her parents are starting to complain about her total dependence on them.

Mrs. R is 26 years old. She moved to Washington about 22 years ago, and completed 11 years of school.

Mrs. A and nine of her children live in a four-bedroom public housing apartment. She became eligible for this apartment 6 years ago when the house she had been living in in Southwest was demolished for urban renewal. Mrs. A prefers the Southwest house because there was more neighborliness and she felt her children were safer. The maintenance of her present apartment is very poor and all winter long there is not enough heat. In fact, in the fall of 1962 her baby died of pneumonia which she thinks he caught because she could not get enough heat in the apartment.

Mrs. A has been receiving public assistance on and off for the past 10 years. Each termination has coincided with a pregnancy. While she was receiving assistance, she got a check for \$249 a month. Mrs. A has made no attempt to get back on public assistance since her last termination for violating the man-in-the-house rule; she says she is "tired of being pushed around." Prior to the last termination Mrs. A says she was continually harassed by investigators parking near her house every night and paying visits at late hours, when they would search the closets and under the beds to "check her children." She felt that if she refused to admit an investigator or was even slow in answering the door, she would be risking her check. At the time of her last termination she was told by a judge that she was a poor mother who put her own pleasure above the welfare of her children.

Mrs. A was born in Washington 36 years ago. She finished eighth grade. She was married when she was 16 but was separated from her husband 5 months later. Her first common law husband is the father of her seven oldest children; her present common law husband is the father of her three youngest children.

Since February, when she was cut off assistance, Mrs. A's common law husband has been coming around openly and trying to support her. He earns \$12 a day when he is able to work as a day laborer. Although his job is affected by weather, he was able to furnish the family \$200 last month. All of the children as well as Mrs. A are fond of him and are pleased to have him around. Mrs. A has also received help with her rent, clothing, and food from private agencies and from her church since termination.

Mrs. A was receiving surplus food until last September when she was unable to find the carfare to go pick it up and the distribution agency cut her off. She has reapplied for surplus food and expected to be reinstated soon. Finding enough food is a major problem for this family. Occasionally she has had to keep her oldest daughter out of school because she could not feed her breakfast and she did not have the 37 cents needed for lunch. The other five school-age children have only recently been able to get free lunches.

Mrs. A tries to stretch her budget to pay for clothes, but she may have to keep her 4-year-old twins out of school next year because she doesn't have enough clothing for them. Medically, this family has had a variety of problems. In March 1962, Mrs. A spent 3 weeks in the psychiatric ward of District of Columbia General Hospital. She blames this illness on pressure by public assistance investigators. Last winter she also had, in addition to a hysterectomy, a kidney ailment which still requires medical attention, and three bouts of flu. One child was hospitalized for 3 weeks for a bladder ailment and still needs medical attention. The baby's death last fall caused shock in her 14-year-old daughter, and she had to be sent to live for 2 months with her grandmother. Other medical problems which her children have include headaches, undependable legs due to suspected rheumatic heart, heart murmur, trancelike states, and weak eye muscles causing unbalanced vision. Medical attention is sought only when carfare is available to get to a free clinic.

Mrs. C has just started receiving monthly public assistance checks again, after being without them since September 1962. She and her six children, ranging in age from 7 to 16 years, have been living in a two-bedroom apartment for almost 4 years, for which they pay \$68 a month, not counting utilities.

For the first 3 months after her public assistance was discontinued, Mrs. C managed to pay the rent and keep her utilities bills paid by working full time as a domestic. However, her income from this employment was about \$75 less a month, and Mrs. C began to fall behind. Her electricity was cut off in late December or January, and she went without heat for a week. She avoided having the gas cut off by locking the door and hiding whenever anyone came to turn it off. The landlady suspended the rent, on the agreement that Mrs. C would pay it a little at a time when she could find the money. Altogether, the debt ran to \$340, the only money Mrs. C owes.

During this period, Mrs. C's three daughters received free lunches at school, but her sons did not. The family continued to receive surplus food except for a short period after public assistance was terminated, until Mrs. C could reestablish her eligibility. They were able to get food from a private welfare agency once in a while, and a friend helped out by sharing food from meal to meal. Even so,

the family ate nothing but oatmeal three times a day for more than a month at one point.

The children have often had to stay out of school because of lack of clothing, especially shoes and coats during the winter; the 11-year-old son had to wear a coat and shoes belonging to the 14-year-old daughter for a time until public assistance was reinstated. They have also missed school because there was no soap for washing. Mrs. C managed to keep all the children at home during this period, except when they went to stay with a friend during Mrs. C's 4-week recovery from an operation for fibroid tumors.

Mrs. C was born in a large southern city, where she finished about 4 years of school. She came to Washington when she was about 19.

Last fall, the Welfare Department told Mrs. T to get a job and that they would no longer send her the \$175 per month she had been receiving. Mrs. T, her five children, and her granddaughter moved into her sister's four-room apartment which is in a substandard alley building. A kerosene stove is used for cooking. The public assistance check of \$87 which her sister receives is the sole cash income of these eight people. Mrs. T has reapplied for assistance and although she received an emergency relief check in March for \$175, she has received nothing since and she has not yet heard whether she will be reinstated.

Mrs. T is about 40 years old. She grew up in a small town and can neither read nor write. She last worked about 14 years ago as a hotel maid. She has never married and the fathers of her older children live in other jurisdictions and cannot be located and ordered to help support. The father of her youngest children was killed a year ago but while he was alive, he was helping her. She has, in addition to the five children at home, three children who have their own homes.

On the day of the interview the refrigerator contained only a bottle of water; there was no food in the house. Mrs. T said that this is a frequent occurrence. She has been promised surplus food, but so far, no coupons have come. Her sister receives only a few items of surplus food. The children are not participating in the free lunch program; in fact, one of their teachers has told Mrs. T that they must come home for lunch. On the day of the interview the children were sent to school with no breakfast and Mrs. T considered herself fortunate to have found some cabbage for their lunch. The children had to stay home for nearly 2 months this winter because they had no shoes and no warm clothing. When she received an assistance check in March, Mrs. T used a good part of it to buy her children shoes so that they could return to school.

Mrs. H has been doing pretty well since her public assistance was terminated a year and a half ago. Mrs. H had a difficult time for about 2 months after she was terminated. She was able to get help with her rent and in finding a job from a private agency, though, and her family and friends helped out. Now she has a full-time job as a domestic which brings in \$140 a month, slightly more than she was receiving from welfare. Mrs. H is happier now that she is on her own, because she has more privacy and she hopes she won't have to depend on public assistance again.

The family usually has enough to eat; Mrs. H has not applied for surplus food, because she would have to take time out from work to pick up her allotment. Her 9-year-old son does not get lunch at school because Mrs. H prefers that he come home at noon. Mrs. H and her children are all in good health, and have had no medical problems recently.

Mrs. H is 23 years old. She grew up in the District and finished 7 years of school. She had her first child when she was about 14 years old. The family has lived in a five-

room public housing apartment for the past 4 years. The apartment is in need of paint and some repairs to the walls, and the roof leaks when there is a heavy rain.

Mrs. B and two of her children, aged 13 and 8, eat, cook, sleep and live in one room. The room for which Mrs. B pays \$60 per month plus utilities, contains two beds, a couch, two chairs and a table. Everything and everyone is quite crowded. Mrs. B has two older sons who do not live with her. Her 30-year-old son has been in St. Elizabeths for several years; the 32-year-old supports his own family but has nothing left over with which to help his mother.

Mrs. B is about 50 years old. She was born in a small town where she finished 8 years of education. She moved to Washington when she was about 30 and she has been separated from her husband for the past several years.

Through the Welfare Department, Mrs. B receives about \$8 per week from her absent husband. The Department, in addition to the \$32 given her by her husband, gives her \$124 per month. She also gets surplus food.

Mrs. B was temporarily cut off assistance in March and April when the Department decided she should get a job. In May she was reinstated. During the time she was cut off, a private agency gave her emergency relief, but refused to give her permanent relief because they felt, as did the Welfare Department, that she should earn her own money. Mrs. B is a diabetic and for medical reasons cannot do the heavy work demanded of domestics. She does not think she could get any kind of job that would not require physical labor beyond her strength.

During March and April she could not pay her rent and she begged food from her neighbors. For these 2 months she had no income at all. Her landlady has been very understanding but now that Mrs. B is again receiving assistance, she owes her landlady \$140 for back rent and utilities and, of course, the Welfare Department did not give her the \$312 of missing income for March and April (including support payments from her husband) when she was reinstated. Her debts will have to be made up from her current monthly income of \$156.

Mrs. B has only one dress. Whatever money she can save for clothing after she has paid for rent and food, goes for her children's clothes. Her children receive free lunch at school but at home she frequently has to omit meals because she is constantly running through her food budget before the end of the week.

Mrs. G has lived in Washington all her life. She and her five children, who range from 10 months to 6 years old, live in a four-room apartment where the floor is warped and has holes in it, and the wallpaper and plaster have begun to fall off the walls. The family has lived there for about 2 years.

Until March 1962, Mrs. G had been receiving public assistance, but it was stopped after her caseworker discovered that she was pregnant. Shortly after, Mrs. G got behind in her rent, and asked for help from two private agencies. Neither of them was able to help. Since then, the family has gotten along on money sent by Mrs. G's husband, from whom she is separated, and by the father of the baby. When these contributions come on schedule, and they sometimes don't, Mrs. G has about \$160 a month to spend. With this money she has been able to keep the rent up, but for the last year, the family has had no electricity or gas. Both were cut off when she was unable to pay the \$112 she owes the utilities companies.

The G family often has to give up things in order to have enough food. They are short on clothing, the children need shoes, and three of the boys have gone for 6 months without haircuts. Mrs. G receives surplus food, and her 6-year-old daughter gets free lunch at school, but even so once in a while

they don't have enough to eat. Since public assistance was terminated, Mrs. G hasn't been able to buy enough clothing or shoes—"it's always giving up one for the other—food for clothes, clothes for food. When I was getting ADC there were times that I could squeeze out something to buy clothes, but now I can get nothing.

Mrs. V lives in a four-room apartment with her two children, 6 and 5, in a very old building which is, nevertheless, well maintained. She supports her family on her \$106 salary which she earns as a drugstore counter girl.

Mrs. V, who is 26, was born in Washington. She finished 11th grade. Her first child was born when she was 20, the second a year later. She has never married.

She received monthly public assistance and surplus food from 1959 until August 1962. At that time, the Welfare Department wanted her to take a training course for an unskilled occupation. Mrs. V wanted to take a training course to become a nurse's aid or a typist in order to make enough money to pay for babysitting. When she refused to take the course offered her by the Welfare Department, her assistance was cut off. Mrs. V feels resentful that the Welfare Department would not allow her to train for some occupation other than an unskilled one.

During the 3 years she received public assistance, Mrs. V lived on a monthly check of \$134 plus surplus food. Her surplus food allotment was terminated at the same time financial assistance ended. Mrs. V is humiliated when she has to ask friends and neighbors for food and clothing. After Mrs. V pays her rent of \$67.50, she has \$38.50 left over to pay for utilities and to buy clothing and food for her family of three. She has managed to keep out of debt, but occasionally she has to get emergency relief from private social agencies or beg for food and used clothes from people she knows. The school-age child is not officially on the free lunch program; however, she frequently gets free food at school because of absences of children who are on the program.

Mrs. V will not reapply for assistance because she is still adamant in not wanting to be trained for unskilled work. She feels she has the intelligence to do unskilled work without training, but would welcome training for a better job so that she could make more money and become self-sufficient.

Last January Mrs. B was forced to quit her job as a maid in a dress shop in order to have her third child. After the baby was born, Mrs. B applied for public assistance until she could get back on her feet, but was refused. Since she had no money saved, she had to ask her sister for help in paying the rent and buying food for the family. Mrs. B's sister is employed as a domestic in the school system, and just where the money will come from when the schools close for the summer is not clear to Mrs. B. The father of the baby has not offered her any help since he gave her \$25 several months ago, which went to help pay the doctor.

Mrs. B lives in a five-room public housing apartment with two of her children. An 8-year-old son has been living since he was a baby with Mrs. B's aunt, who has taken over all the responsibility for bringing him up.

Two or three times a week, Mrs. B runs out of food, and her 10-year-old daughter is almost always hungry. The family does not receive surplus food, nor does the daughter get free lunch at school. Since Mrs. B had to quit her job, there is never enough money to buy food, even though her sister helps out when she can. Most of the family's clothing comes from relatives, and, with the exception of shoes, the family doesn't lack what clothes they need. Mrs. B can't afford to buy the eyeglasses her daughter needs, though.

Except for some money she owes to the doctor for her delivery, Mrs. B has managed to keep from running any debts. She hopes

to be able to get back to work before her sister's money runs out or the bills pile up too deeply.

Mrs. B, who is 30, grew up on a farm and finished 9 years of school. She moved to Washington 7 years ago.

Life for Mrs. E has been looking up. In May, after a year of no income, Mrs. E's \$214 assistance payments began coming again. When her check came, she and her six children, including her month-old baby, were able to move into a 6-room frame house. Inside, the paper is peeling off the walls, there are rat holes, and she complains of roaches. Her children are covered with bed-bug bites but she is working hard to rid her home of these pests. All of her furniture, belongings, and clothing were destroyed in a truck which caught fire. She is slowly acquiring replacements.

A year ago May, while Mrs. E was receiving public assistance, a Welfare investigator found a man in her apartment. This man, whom Mrs. E described as "a drunken nuisance—a midget who is about 60 years old," was called Mrs. E's boy friend by the Welfare Department, although she says he is not even a close friend.

When her checks ceased, Mrs. E had no income at all. In June she was forced to place her children in Junior Village. After 2 weeks she began to feel that they would be placed in foster homes, so she took them out. She went to work as a domestic for a brief time during the summer of 1962. Her five older children are all epileptics. All but the oldest have frequent seizures and require competent care. The month-old baby has shown no signs of the disorder so far.

From May until December Mrs. E's family survived by means of emergency help of food, clothing, and occasional cash from a private agency and a citizens' group. None of this aid was on a regular basis and their total income each month averaged far below what it was when they were receiving public assistance. By December Mrs. E's pregnancy was beginning to be obvious and she was embarrassed to ask for more help. What food the family had was begged from neighbors.

In February, then 7 months pregnant, she was evicted with her five children. She owed \$150 in back rent and \$25 for utilities. The family had had no heat or hot food during the early part of the winter because the gas had been turned off. When she was evicted, a friend offered Mrs. E the use of his truck to transport her clothes and furnishings. It was at this point that Mrs. E's belongings were destroyed by fire.

Mrs. E and her family, with only the clothes on their backs, had nowhere to go. A church group offered to let them sleep in the church for the first three nights. While they stayed there, they had to be locked in and had to wait each morning until 10 a.m. until the caretaker arrived to let them out. The next two nights they spent sleeping on the floor of the home of an alcoholic acquaintance of Mrs. E. After this, until the end of April, the family slept in unlocked cars. So great was the family's concern with surviving the cold, getting food, and finding a place to get warm that the two school-age children hardly attended school at all this year. Mrs. E has been eligible for surplus food but, lacking carfare and a place to store and cook it, she has only recently been able to take advantage of her eligibility. During the winter, the family frequently went for 2 or 3 days without any food at all—only water. Mrs. E's pregnancy inhibited her from applying to a private agency for help during this time.

Perhaps the only steady source of help for this family has come from the male acquaintance of Mrs. E's who offered the use of his truck for transporting her belongings when she was evicted. The toll of this help is high, however. Mrs. E's 12-year-old daughter

has submitted to being "fondled" by him so that the family can gain by his presents to her. Mrs. E does not approve and has asked him not to return for fear of jeopardizing her relief status by violating the man-in-the-house rule, but evidently the man is more persistent than she is persuasive, for he keeps returning.

Mrs. E is 26 years old. She grew up in a small town and has lived in Washington on and off for 10 years. Although she had her first child when she was 14 years old, she finished 11th grade. Her husband, who is the father of her five older children, is an epileptic. They have been separated for about 3 years. Mrs. E receives \$5 per week from him. These support payments started in April, a month before she was reinstated. From May last year until April of this year Mrs. E had no regular income. Survival for 11 months was based solely on emergency aid on an irregular basis from private agencies and from her daughter's self-appointed "godfather."

Now her income is \$234 including her husband's payments and it is coming in regularly. Although she has debts of \$175 which concern her, she is only hoping that she can continue on this level. Because it is humiliating, Mrs. E wishes that she did not have to receive public assistance. When she was applying for reinstatement one welfare worker said to her, "I just don't believe that you don't have a job—you look too clean * * * or else you must be selling yourself."

Mrs. S and her five preschool children have managed to get along without any regular income since her public assistance was terminated in September 1962, because they have a landlady on whom they can be virtually completely dependent. Mrs. S had been receiving \$169 a month from the Welfare since her husband was sent to prison in 1961; since September 1962 the only cash income she has had is that which she has been able to borrow from the landlady, and one contribution from her church.

The family lives in a three-room basement apartment in the landlady's private home and shares a bath on the first floor. When Mrs. S could afford to, she paid \$75 a month plus utilities for these rooms. Now the landlady has allowed the rent to run about 7 months behind. Mrs. S hasn't been able to keep up the utilities, either, and her gas has been turned off.

Mrs. S who is 22 years old, came to Washington 3 years ago. She grew up in a large city, where she finished high school.

The S family often has to give up such things as clothing and laundry soap in order to have enough food to eat, even though they receive surplus food. They were able to get food from a private welfare agency twice during the winter, but were refused the last time they went back. Important help comes from the landlady, who often feeds the family—these are the only hot meals the S's ever have. Clothing, too, comes primarily from the landlady, if at all. In fact, "Without the help of [the landlady], I would probably starve."

Mrs. S has reapplied for public assistance, but has been waiting for 6 or 7 months for a decision. "The waiting to get on has been unbearable. However, I can understand them for wanting to be sure a person is qualified."

Mrs. I lives in a five-room basement apartment with her four children. She moved to this apartment 6 months ago when her public assistance was terminated and she was evicted from her former apartment. The rent, which is \$65 a month, is higher than before, but her landlady is very lenient with her. She owes \$200 in back rent and \$97 for utilities. The landlady has paid her electricity bill so that it could be turned back on. She has been without heat for 4 months.

Mrs. I received \$165 a month in public assistance until she was asked to bring in the

fathers of her children last September. She gave her caseworker their addresses. To her surprise, she had her assistance terminated with no explanation or promise that the fathers would help support her. She has received no financial assistance or help from the fathers since September. When assistance was terminated and she was evicted last fall, Mrs. I didn't know where to turn. The family was constantly hungry and was dependent on friends for handouts of food and clothing. When she found her present apartment, which is substandard, rat infested, and lacks refrigeration, she again applied for assistance, but was refused. With the debts accumulating, she took a job as a domestic earning \$160 per month, which is about what she got while on public assistance before; however, she did not have to pay a babysitter as she does now while she works.

Mrs. I does not have enough money every month to pay the babysitter, buy food, and pay the rent and utilities. She buys no clothing. The oldest child was out of school frequently this winter because she lacked shoes, boots, and warm clothing. Mrs. I's employer gives her secondhand clothing occasionally. When she can scrape up the carfare, Mrs. I can pick up her surplus food. Before the distribution of surplus food was decentralized, she could count on surplus food each month. Now she never knows if she will have the 50 cents she needs to ride the bus and pick it up. The family runs completely out of food about once a week. She buys all the food she can once a week, after she has paid the babysitter, but there is never enough food and there is never enough money.

Mrs. I is very bitter about the Welfare Department. She feels that she complied with their wishes by supplying the names and addresses of the children's fathers and that she was cut off with no explanation and no substitution for the income she had been receiving. When she was refused after she reapplied in February, she was told that the fathers should support the children and her but she has no way that she knows about to make them do so and the Welfare Department has evidently not made her aware of the means by which she can get support. Unless she can make less expensive child-care arrangements, her future will be a continuation of the present—increasing debts and constant hunger.

Mrs. T is a 19-year-old mother who, with her 13-month baby and her husband, lives with her brother- and sister-in-law and their three children in a five-room apartment. Mr. T and his brother both work to support the eight people in their family. Mr. and Mrs. T's income last month, which was about average, was \$260.

The family does not go hungry and purchases new clothes. The apartment, which belongs to the brother- and sister-in-law, however, is overcrowded, rat and roach infested. The floors and ceilings were in urgent need of repair and the furniture was dilapidated and soiled.

Mrs. T was born and raised in Washington where she finished eighth grade. Her baby was born when she was 18 and she married her husband when the baby was about 8 months old. Mrs. T was receiving public assistance after her baby was born up until last September when her caseworker discovered that she had plans to be married. Assistance was terminated immediately although the marriage did not and could not take place immediately.

Mr. and Mrs. T would like to have an apartment of their own but, from the appearance of the furniture and the clothing worn by Mrs. T and the baby, the interviewer surmised that Mr. T who was present during the interview, spent a good part of his income outside the home.

Mrs. A and her 18-year-old daughter live in a three-room public housing apartment.

Mrs. A who is 37 years old, was born in Washington and finished 8 years of school here. She has about \$95 a month income, usually, but it is not clear just where the money comes from. Mrs. A had a part-time job as a domestic until December 1962, but has not worked since.

Mrs. A, who has never been married, has three other children who are living elsewhere; two are married and her 16-year-old son lives with an aunt.

Right after she stopped working, Mrs. A spent 2 months in the hospital, suffering from hypertension. Her health is generally poor. During February after she returned home, it was necessary for her to seek help from a private welfare agency in order to have food to eat. When she can afford them, Mrs. A's clothes are bought in second-hand stores. Since she stopped working, Mrs. A has bought no clothing at all. She owes the National Capital Housing Authority approximately \$90 in back rent.

Mrs. A feels that the Welfare Department is helpful, but she is bothered about being questioned repeatedly about the same things.

Mrs. L received \$100 per month in public assistance from March 1960 until July 1962 for herself and her three children. They have been living with her parents and her brother in a seven-room house for the last 12 years. The Welfare Department ruled that her brother and her father were both employable males living in the home and that she was no longer eligible for assistance.

Mrs. L, who is 27, grew up in a small town and moved to Washington when she was 15. Here she finished 12th grade. She had her first child when she was 17 years old. Her third and youngest daughter is 4. The father of this child gives her \$15 per month in support. The fathers of the other two children cannot be found and they do not contribute to the support of their children.

Mrs. L works full time as a waitress, earning \$37 per week plus tips. Her brother also brings income into the home from his job as a roofer. He is seasonally employed, but when he works he earns \$10 per day. In April, Mrs. L's income from her job and from the father of her youngest daughter was \$163. While her situation since she has gone to work has improved, she still does not have sufficient resources for her family's needs.

The family manages to keep from going hungry by giving up clothing. The school-age child does not receive free lunches, but neither hunger nor lack of clothing has kept this child out of school. By pooling resources this family is managing to get by although the house they live in is rat infested and run down.

Mrs. J has lived with her four children in a five-room public housing apartment for the past 3 years. Until November 1962, the family was receiving \$187 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. Then, when investigators found her estranged husband in the house, her public assistance was terminated. Between November and March, Mrs. J was dependent for rent money and food on a private welfare agency. In March, Mrs. J found a job which pays her \$185 a month. But she and the children are less well off than when they were receiving public assistance, because Mrs. J must pay \$36 a month for transportation to her job, as well as fees to someone to care for the children, who range in age between 4 and 9 years. Mrs. J estimates that she needs at least \$40 a month more for food than she currently has.

The J family often has to give up clothing and shoes in order to have enough food (their surplus food allotment was recently terminated without explanation, and Mrs. J. hasn't had time to straighten out the matter); and they haven't been able to start replacing their furniture, which was repossessed. Because money for clothing must be

spent on food, the three school-age children often have to stay out of school because they don't have enough clothes (missing their free school lunches). The children were out of school the week of the interview because they needed shoes, and Mrs. J had no money to buy them. She is in trouble with school authorities because the children miss so much school.

Both Mrs. J and her 9-year-old son currently consult a psychiatrist, although neither has been hospitalized. Mrs. J says that the "nerves" of herself and her son are traceable to the difficulties of maintaining the family and to the strains involved in Mr. J's desertion.

Mrs. J, who is 30 years old, is a native of Washington and finished 11 years of school.

Mrs. P is 22 years old and lives with her six children, her mother, her brother, and three roomers in an eight-room house. One bathroom serves all 11 members of this household. While the house is in fair condition, there are ratholes, roaches, and Mrs. P complains of bedbugs. Last winter they used coal and wood to heat the house and at times they went without heat. The family is in arrears with their light and gas bills; the telephone has been disconnected.

Mrs. P works 1 day a week as a domestic, which, last month, gave her an income of \$40. This is her usual income. Her mother is irregularly employed as a domestic, and although Mrs. P could not estimate her mother's income, it is clear that her mother's wages plus the rent from the three boarders bring in most of the income this family has. Her brother suffered a multiple leg fracture in January and is still recuperating and unable to work.

Mrs. P was born in Washington and finished ninth grade. When she was 16, she had her first child. Her six children range from 2 months to 6 years, and they have been fathered by four men. Neither Mrs. P nor her mother has ever married; in fact, Mrs. P has never met her own father. Of the four fathers of her children, only one gives Mrs. P any help and this is sporadic and undependable. She does not know the whereabouts of the other three men.

Mrs. P applied for public assistance in December of 1962. She was told that in order to qualify she must bring the fathers of her children into the Welfare Department. She has not been able to locate them and she has given up the idea of public assistance. She thinks the burden of finding the fathers and bringing them into the Department is impossible and if this is the only way in which she can qualify for help, she will have to do without it.

She received surplus food from 1958 until December 1962. When the distribution point was moved to Southwest, she found the 40-block walk too far and she did not have the carfare to go pick it up. Getting enough food is a serious problem. The family manages to get one meal a day, but the school-age child had gone to school without any breakfast on the day of the interview. A donation of canned meat by a friend meant that the child would have some lunch; otherwise he would have had to wait until dinner to eat. Clothing has been donated by a church group, but the schoolchild had to stay home for a week this winter when he had no shoes.

Mrs. P faces eviction because of overcrowding. She has been warned by the owner of the building several times but another building inspection is pending and this time she thinks she will have to comply. She is very worried about this because, without sharing space with her mother and brother and the three roomers, she does not know how she will manage to pay her rent.

Mrs. A's public assistance was terminated in June 1962, when it was established that her husband, who had deserted her in 1950, had returned to live with Mrs. A and their

17-year-old son in their two-bedroom apartment. Mr. A had received a lump-sum disability retirement payment, which the family calculated would last them for about a year. But Mr. A spent the money in half that time, and with a usual monthly income of \$63, the family has had to rely on help from a few of the 10 children who have grown up and moved away. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. A, who is 52 years old, are able to work. Mrs. A last worked 8 years ago, when she developed a disabling heart condition.

The A's don't always have enough food in the house. When this happens they have to ask their children for help. In April, they received \$10 worth of food from relatives; also, sometimes the A's can eat a meal with relatives. The family receives surplus food, but it is sometimes hard to get it. Mr. A's disability makes it impossible to grasp objects, and Mrs. A sometimes find it hard to walk to the surplus food depot, although she is usually able to take the bus back home.

One of the A's grown sons pays for their medicine, and a daughter takes care of Mrs. A's doctor bills. Mrs. A has been going to a private doctor for a year, and feels that she is improving, although she is totally disabled. However, even with the help from their children, the A's have been unable to buy some of the medicines they need or to get to the doctor and clinic as often as they should.

The A's have few clothing problems, since their relatives are able to help out here, too. The 17-year-old son is not able to get haircuts frequently, nor to keep up on clothing styles like his friends, but the family does not have to give up important things to have enough clothing, and the son has not missed school because of lack of clothes.

With the help of their children, the A's have managed to keep their rent and other bills current; their only debt is one for \$23 for a household appliance.

Mrs. S has been refused public assistance on four separate occasions because she cannot get the father of her three youngest children to come to the Welfare Department for an interview. He occasionally gives her money for the children, but it varies from about \$20 to \$12, which he gave her in April. The father of her 12-year-old daughter does not contribute anything at all and he cannot be found. The father of her three youngest is a gambler and is undependable. He is under no court order to support her.

Mrs. S lives in a four-room apartment with her mother, father, and four children. The apartment is crowded, rat and roach infested, and needs replastering and reflooring. A sheet of plastic covers the broken upper half of the front door, and the windows are broken and cracked. The gas has been turned off in the apartment for several months. There is no heat or hot water, and they use a two-burner oil stove for cooking. They heated the apartment in the winter by using the fireplace and foraging for coal in the neighborhood. The broken windows are filled with newspaper.

Mrs. S, who is 29, grew up in Washington and finished fourth grade. She was 17 years old when she had her first child. Her younger three children, all fathered by the same man, began appearing about 8 years later. She has never married.

Mrs. S is supported by her father who is seasonally employed as a construction worker. If he works a full week, he is paid about \$60 and this money supports seven people.

The family does not seem to go hungry, although the school-age child does not receive free lunch unless a regular recipient is absent. This child and Mrs. S were both hospitalized, over a year each, for tuberculosis. The grandmother has diabetes. All three of these members of the family require continuing medical care and special diets which they are unable to afford.

Mrs. M, who is 43 years old, lives alone in a four-room house. She has lived there for

about a year. Mrs. M was born in a large city, and came to Washington 31 years ago. She has three children, all of whom are grown and live in another city. She has had no education.

Between October 1962 and April 1963, Mrs. M received \$83 a month from the Department of Public Welfare. She had just spent a month in the hospital recovering from surgery for gallstones and ulcers, which had forced her to leave her job as a domestic. Mrs. M also suffers from a lung ailment, for which she had an operation in 1961, when she spent 4 months in the hospital. Now her only source of income is sewing dresses for small girls, which brings in as much as \$3 to \$4 some weeks. Her children are able to help with a little food now and then, but have their own families to support. Mrs. M used to get some help, about \$10 a week, from a friend who has since been sent to a mental institution.

Mrs. M is a month behind in her rent. She expects to be evicted soon unless she can find the rent, but doesn't know where to look for it. She has had to take part of the rent money to buy food, but still has a problem getting enough to eat. Besides that, she often feels ill, because she cannot afford to buy the foods for the ulcer diet prescribed by her doctor following the last operation. Mrs. M received surplus food until her public assistance was terminated. She believes that she is not eligible for the allotment since she does not receive welfare aid.

For several years until March 1962, Mrs. V received \$212 per month public assistance for herself and her six children. She is presently pregnant with her seventh child. She has been married for 8 years, but her husband does not live continuously with her, although he is the father of all her children. In March 1962, her husband told the Welfare Department that he would support his family. He has not been willing to do this on a sustained basis. He has spent his money on his own needs and has given his wife and children only sporadic support. Mrs. V thinks that he is currently in jail. Mrs. V has been dependent on private social agencies for emergency relief since her public assistance was terminated. In April her income was \$70.

Mrs. V lives in a three-bedroom, minimally furnished public housing unit. She was fortunate enough to get into the project while she was still receiving assistance. Now she has trouble meeting her lowered rent payments of \$33. She is also \$40 behind in her utility payments and she says that the heat has frequently been turned off since she had been off assistance. Mrs. V's family occasionally has to go without food. She is eligible for surplus food but she does not have the carfare to get it and it is too far to walk to the distribution center.

Mrs. V is 29 years old. She was born in Washington and she finished ninth grade. She had her first child when she was 20.

Her three older children receive free lunches at school but there are times during the winter when they cannot go to school because they do not have sufficient clothing and lack shoes.

Mrs. V does not know from week to week where she will find help and money to buy the things she needs. She hopes to get back on public assistance but first she must locate her husband and be investigated. In the meantime, she is pregnant and unable to work.

Mrs. Q lives with her sister, her husband, and their four children in a somewhat rundown six-room house. They have lived there for about 4 years. Between March and September of 1962, Mrs. Q received \$220 a month in public assistance while Mr. Q was disabled with a broken ankle. Since he has been out of his cast, Mr. Q has been able to work only sporadically at his job as a construction laborer. Although in a good month the family has slightly more income

than they did from public assistance, Mr. Q's inability to work some days often cuts into the budget. Mrs. Q is reluctant to try to find work, because she feels that her children, aged 9 to 12 years, need her supervision and guidance as they grow up even more than when they were younger. Last winter, Mrs. Q tried to get help from two private agencies, but was unsuccessful. Her brother has been able to help out with some money occasionally.

The family receives surplus food, and the children get free lunches. But, although the Q's seldom go without food, they often are unable to eat the kinds of things they want. Getting clothing is a greater problem. The family frequently needs shoes, but there isn't always enough money around to buy them. The children have had to stay out of school once in a while because they lacked shoes.

The family has several bills they have been unable to pay. They are about 2 weeks behind in the rent, and Mrs. Q had to take part of the rent money to pay an overdue utilities bill, so that the service would not be turned off. They owe \$30 for another utility, and their electricity has been cut off. The Q's are paying off debts for furniture and clothing a little at a time.

The Q family has had a series of accidents, but has been able to have them cared for in free medical facilities. Besides Mr. Q's broken ankle, there have been the 10-year-old daughter's broken knee and Mrs. Q's broken arm and the sprained ankle she had at the time of the interview. In 1959, Mrs. Q spent 8 months in the hospital with a nervous breakdown. Mrs. Q was able to get her daughter's eyes examined while she was receiving public assistance, but before she could get the glasses, assistance was terminated, and now she can't afford the glasses. Mrs. Q would like to leave her husband, because he drinks heavily and doesn't support the family reliably. But she is afraid that she could not qualify for public assistance, and doesn't want to leave the children alone while she works. She feels unhappy about her situation, but doesn't know what to do to solve it.

In October 1962, Mrs. E received from the Welfare Department the following "notice of ineligibility":

"On the basis of information available to us, we find that you are no longer eligible to receive assistance because:

"On September 21, 1962, your son . . . said he would give you \$15 per month starting September 26, 1962. You say he has given you nothing. He will have to come with you to the office to discuss this if he cannot give it to you.

"With your \$64 a month from social security and his \$15 it is sufficient to meet your needs according to agency standards."

With this notice, Mrs. E's monthly income dropped from \$144 to \$64. Her son, because he has a family of his own to support, has been unable to give her the monthly \$15 ordered by the Welfare Department.

Among the hardships she endures is living in a third-floor room of a boarding house. She moved to this room after assistance was terminated in order to reduce her rent. She is eligible for surplus food but complains that the Department sometimes sends her the card too late for her to go pick it up. It is very difficult for her to carry her allotment home and she frequently lacks the carfare to go get it.

Mrs. E has lived all her life in the District. She finished the eighth grade and was widowed after a long marriage in 1959. She went on public assistance after her husband died because he had left no provision for her other than social security and her children all have families of their own to support. She has not bought any clothing since her husband died.

Mrs. D, her common law husband, and her 3- and 10-year-old children live in a private

home. They have two rooms of their own and share the bath and kitchen. Mrs. D was receiving \$141 a month in public assistance until September 1962. She had been asked to find a job and given time to do so; then her welfare grant was terminated. Now the family does well, with Mrs. D's \$140 a month income from domestic work, and her husband's \$240 from his job as a stock clerk in a Government agency.

The D's have no particular problems getting enough to eat or enough clothing to wear. They are able to buy their clothes in new clothing stores. The family does not have any bills, and their rent and utilities are paid up. None of the family has been ill recently.

Mrs. D grew up on a farm and came to Washington 8 years ago. She had 8 years of school.

COMMENTS OF SOCIAL SECURITY STUDY

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, I would like to have your comments on this.

Mr. GALVIN. This is a study, according to the Bureau of Social Science Research who made the study, based on persons selected by an accidental sampling method. In other words, it isn't a random sampling. It isn't a judgment sampling. It is merely an accidental sampling, and as such in my opinion, and I think Mr. Lajewski could speak better to that, it cannot be projected and is not valid except for the 50 cases in the study. It is not a projection of all of the ineligibles. It is no projection of any part of the ineligibles except the 50 cases in the study.

Mr. Lajewski, would you—
Senator BYRD. Would you like to accommodate us?

Mr. GALVIN. From the statistical point of view?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I would only comment to the effect that this study is simply a descriptive study of the situation of families who were involved either in having their cases closed or applications for public assistance rejected. This would be the limit of my comments on this particular study at this time.

CONCLUSIONS OF STUDY

Senator BYRD. Would you consider it a scientific random sample from which certain conclusions could be reached by way of projection of the figures? In other words, could you reach conclusions concerning the overall caseload or the overall number of cases which have been rejected by virtue of their having been found ineligible?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. With properly designed studies you could make general conclusions.

Senator BYRD. That is not the question I asked you.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I do not consider that this is a random sample. The study actually states that this is not a random sample; it also indicates that any conclusions to be drawn are severely limited. I think that the persons who wrote this report were taking a sound precaution when they stated this in their report.

Senator BYRD. You did not consider this to be a properly designed study from which conclusions could be drawn and from which projections could be made.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I want to be careful—
Senator BYRD. Except as to the 50 families.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Except as to the 50 families, no general conclusions can be drawn about families whose cases were closed or whose applications were rejected.

Senator BYRD. Yes.

EXCERPT FROM REPORT OF STUDY

Mr. GALVIN. If I could make a comment about it, Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of their report the Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., states:

"The reader is cautioned against assuming uniformity among the cases, given the great variation that exists. Generalizing

about all terminated cases is also dangerous because of the possible biases produced by methods of sampling."

This study is of 50 families, which, I believe, are families that were found ineligible over a period of the last 2 to 3 years. I don't have the exact dates. I didn't analyze it for that. But I believe that some cases were terminated as early as 1960 or 1961 and the study I believe was made around April or May of 1963. To the best of my knowledge, the 50 families include 2 in the OA category, 44 in the ADC category, 1 in the GPA category, and 3 that were unknown.

Senator BYRD. What method was used for selecting the 50 cases, Mr. Galvin? I had started to read this report and had done some underlining, as you can see, but I never completed it.

Mr. GALVIN. On page 2 of the report they state:

"Eighteen were people who had recently applied for help from one of five private welfare agencies. The remainder were located by a variety of techniques: Interviewers were assigned to a door-to-door canvass of certain blocks in three census tracts with high public assistance rates in 1960; one interviewer canvassed all 577 units of a public housing project; other interviewers were instructed to ask respondents and others they met whether they knew of anyone who would fit the study criteria and to attempt to interview them."

"This sampling plan, which might best be described as accidental, and the small number of cases, impose limitations on the interpretation of findings and the extent to which generalizations can be made that would apply to all terminated cases in the District."

Eighteen of the 50, which is 36 percent, is quite high in relation to the number of families that other studies have shown apply to public welfare agencies. I think there was a recent report, if I remember correctly, on the public welfare crisis in the District of Columbia which showed by their check that about 6 percent had applied to private agencies for assistance of the cases terminated or rejected for the period July-October 1962.

NUMBER OF 50 FAMILIES BACK ON ROLLS

Another interesting point about these 50 eligibles is that 12 of them are back on the assistance and 6 of them have applications pending.

Senator BYRD. Twelve of the 50?

Mr. GALVIN. As of June 20, 1963, 12 of the 50 are back on assistance and 6 of them have applications pending.

Senator BYRD. In other words, as I understand it, this group of cases was selected by accidental means. A portion of them was selected by going to the various private agencies and possibly inquiring from those agencies as to persons who were being aided and who were former public assistance recipients. Some of these, of course, were, as you have pointed out, recipients of public assistance many, many months before the study was conducted and had been dropped from the caseload many months before. Would one not expect to really get the worst of all the cases by pursuing this method?

Mr. GALVIN. Well, as I said, before, 18 of the 50 were from private welfare agencies and the public welfare crisis report on page 39 states, and I quote:

"It was reported that 53 families with 233 children who had been cut off or rejected by ADC applied to voluntary agencies other than the Salvation Army in the period July-October 1962."

Now, according to their report on page 38, the number of terminations of assistance during this period was 867 and the number of rejections of applications were 1,163, or a total of 2,030. So only 53 out of 2,030 families applied to voluntary agencies other than the Salvation Army, and yet this "ineligible" study is based on 18 out of 50. So there is a possible bias due to the method of selection.

RESORT TO PRIVATE AGENCIES

Senator BYRD. In other words, I suppose normally one would expect those families that are most desperate to go to the private agencies. Of course, in some instances as this report points out, those who are more resourceful than others in seeking solutions to their plight may have gone to the private agencies.

Mr. GALVIN. Well, I am curious about whether the persons who go to private agencies are also receiving assistance but I would have to look deeper into the cases to check that point. I think that there is cooperation between private and public agencies to attempt to prevent this happening.

Mr. BREWER. Private agencies do not give any direct assistance until all cases are cleared with our file.

Mr. GALVIN. Every one?

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Senator BYRD. What is this?

Mr. BREWER. Before a private agency gives any assistance, it is cleared with our central file to determine the status.

RECIPIENTS WITH SOME EMPLOYMENT

Senator BYRD. Some of your recipients are employed elsewhere. The have income elsewhere, too, but they are getting assistance from you.

Mr. BREWER. Yes.

Senator BYRD. And so the private agency may have called you about that particular person. So he may be getting income elsewhere, income from you, and go to the private agency also.

Mr. BREWER. I do not believe that they are getting income from the private agency and from me because the private agencies have limited resources and before they give any direct assistance, they do clear with our files which is—I am not saying that there are not many recipients that do not go and apply.

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. GALVIN. I think the basic question here is, as I stated at the beginning, whether the study results can be projected and as the researchers themselves say, they cannot be.

Senator BYRD. Yes. Well, they would not likely get aid from all three, yourselves and the private agencies plus outside—

Mr. BREWER. I think that would be most unlikely.

Senator BYRD. Yes.

SOURCES OF SOCIAL SERVICE STUDY INFORMATION

Well now, was it not true, Mr. Galvin, also that the study of the 50 eligibles was based in considerable measure on the information that was procured from the individuals themselves?

Mr. GALVIN. I believe they state somewhere in the report—I don't have it annotated for that—that the research agency could not make the study in the depth that they would have desired, and that most of it is an interview type of study.

Senator BYRD. At the bottom of page 2 I see these words:

"Time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent in which the investigator used a structured interview form."

If I recall correctly, the Comptroller General in his report to the Congress made a statement with reference to the credibility of information secured from recipients. He questioned the credibility of their statements. And I assume that a good bit of the information in this report on the eligibles is based on information that was acquired from the recipients.

ESTIMATE OF REPORT

Mr. GALVIN. I think this study was designed not to be projected but rather as a study on what does happen to some of the

families who are ineligible, and as such, I think it is an interesting document and well worth the time and effort that has been spent on it. I do believe that possibly some people reading it might try to say that this is what happens to all families. This wouldn't be true; the researchers do not state that, and I don't think that the Health and Welfare Council has said anything like that.

Senator BYRD. Some of the 50 could still have been on public assistance, is that correct?

Mr. GALVIN. I didn't analyze it for that factor. In fact, it is impossible to analyze it for that factor, whether they were on or not on assistance at the time the study was made, because I don't know when this study was made.

Senator BYRD. They could have been reinstated though, couldn't they?

Mr. GALVIN. Well, we do know that on June 20, 1963, 12 were on assistance and 6 had applications pending. But the report does not show the date that the study was made.

Senator BYRD. Some of the 50 could have been on assistance, I suppose at the time the report was published.

Mr. BREWER. At the time it was published, whether they were on at the time of the interview or not we have no way of knowing. We cannot identify the descriptive description with the case.

Mr. GALVIN. We have no way of telling.

Senator BYRD. Nor does the study reveal whether or not all cases had actually been closed at the time of the survey.

Mr. GALVIN. As Mr. Brewer said, you cannot relate the descriptions or the case summaries, back to a PAD case.

Mr. BREWER. In June we cleared for the agencies a list of 50 families. Presumably these 50 families. And we advised them of the status of those families in regard to public assistance as of that date of clearance.

Senator BYRD. Does the report indicate the reasons for ineligibility on the part of the 50?

Mr. BREWER. No.

Senator BYRD. It does not.

Mr. BREWER. Except in the descriptive language of the summaries.

Senator BYRD. Does it indicate the average time that was spent on each interview?

Mr. GALVIN. No. Just the statement on page 2 which is that time and cost considerations permitted only a relatively short interview with each respondent, and the relatively short can mean 5 minutes or all day. It depends on what is meant by "relatively" and what is meant by "short."

CASE OF MRS. THOMAS

Senator BYRD. On page 24 a case is cited. The woman made the statement to the persons who interviewed her in connection with this report that the investigators had visited her home at 2 and 3 o'clock in the morning, shining flashlights all over the house, looking in closets, under the bed, everywhere.

What comment do you have on this?

Mr. GALVIN. Well, we have heard this statement 10 to 15 times in the last 2 or 3 years. The investigators do not make visits in the middle of the night. Our ordinary visits to the home of the recipient are between the hours of 8:15 in the morning and 10 p.m. at night. All home visits are made by two investigators, never by one. Due to particular circumstances or some special situation, we do make home visits as early as 6 a.m. and we make visits as late as 11 p.m. But only in certain cases in which we have a very strong suspicion that the father of the children or the husband is in the home.

Senator BYRD. So, as to the recipients with paramours, whether it is 2 or 3 o'clock in the morning or 10 o'clock at night, they are not likely to want the investigators to find them around, are they?

Mr. GALVIN. No, they don't.

Senator BYRD. The same woman said this: "When the investigators come to your house you are supposed to immediately open your door—no matter how you are dressed. This is day or night."

What do you have to say about this?

Mr. GALVIN. This is not true. We knock on the door. We identify ourselves. We ask permission to go in. We ask permission to examine the premises.

Senator BYRD. Suppose the woman says you can't come in.

Mr. GALVIN. We would like some reasonable answer on why we can't come in. If she says, I am dressing, and this happens often, particularly in the morning, we wait, but in waiting we have learned from experience—and I must say it has been a disillusioning experience, that we have to have someone in the rear exit to be sure we catch the man as he goes out.

Senator BYRD. But your investigators don't demand that the woman immediately open the door even though she isn't dressed.

CASES OF DECEPTION DISCUSSED

Mr. GALVIN. No. We have patiently waited for 2 hours for a woman to get dressed. That time she had the man well hidden, but he was found. He was in a closet hanging on the rod with woman's clothes all around him.

If I may I would like to relate another experience we had in relation to finding men in the home. This man was found hanging under a bed. He had his shoes off and he was hanging on the bed springs with his toes and his hands. He was known to be in the home. He had been seen going in and had not come out 2 hours later. The investigators searched the home the first time and they didn't find him.

The supervisor who had been waiting outside said, you must search again. The woman, of course, had denied he was in there before any search was made. We wouldn't make the search if the woman refuses to allow it, produces the man, or if the man identifies himself. The second time they searched they found in an upper bedroom that when they pushed the bed to go by to look in the closet the bed pushed back. He was found hanging under the bed holding onto the bedsprings with his toes and hands.

REACTION OF RECIPIENTS TO DEPARTMENT'S ACTION

Senator BYRD. Do you believe that there are case histories referred to in this report that could be cited as proof that the regulations are good and that it is not the fault of the Welfare Department but rather that of the client as to the difficulties that the client was experiencing?

Mr. GALVIN. I would say that there are. I haven't read the report for possibly 3 weeks, but, as I remember, I found some cases in which even the ex-recipients said that the Welfare Department was perfectly right in cutting them off. There are others—and I am only quoting from memory now. There was one, as I remember, where the woman was on assistance, and she had two or three children from the time her case was approved until she was cut off. Each time she had promised not to do it again. Since she has been cut off, she has had another one. All of them were by the husband. She was pregnant, as I remember, in July of last year when she was cut off, and the report states she is again expecting a child.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, for fiscal years 1959 through 1963, by quarters.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, fiscal years 1957 and 1958 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	1,890	1,762	798	45.3	1958—1st quarter	3,188	2,890	1,112	38.5
2d quarter	2,146	2,195	863	39.3	2d quarter	2,852	2,605	1,246	47.8
3d quarter	2,929	2,564	920	35.9	3d quarter	3,266	3,088	1,161	37.6
4th quarter	3,039	3,130	1,059	33.8	4th quarter	3,073	3,096	1,260	40.7
Fiscal year total	10,004	9,651	3,640	37.7	Fiscal year total	12,379	11,679	4,779	40.9

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for all categories of assistance, fiscal years 1959–63 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter	3,292	2,860	1,187	41.5	1962—1st quarter	2,935	2,961	1,326	44.8
2d quarter	3,026	3,194	1,382	43.3	2d quarter	2,673	2,751	1,205	43.8
3d quarter	3,100	3,144	1,409	44.8	3d quarter	2,636	2,611	1,099	43.8
4th quarter	2,666	2,809	1,200	42.7	4th quarter	2,528	2,649	1,337	50.5
Fiscal year total	12,084	12,007	5,178	43.1	Fiscal year total	10,772	10,872	4,967	45.7
1960—1st quarter	3,021	2,604	1,094	42.0	1963—1st quarter	2,675	2,586	991	38.3
2d quarter	3,051	2,775	1,193	43.0	2d quarter	2,210	2,117	855	40.4
3d quarter	3,362	3,410	1,395	40.9	3d quarter	2,292	2,191	841	38.4
4th quarter	2,837	3,089	1,351	43.7	4th quarter	2,252	2,239	876	39.1
Fiscal year total	12,271	11,878	5,033	42.4	Fiscal year total	9,429	9,133	3,563	39.0
1961—1st quarter	3,050	2,929	1,337	45.6					
2d quarter	2,865	2,696	1,224	54.4					
3d quarter	3,151	2,999	1,281	42.7					
4th quarter	2,917	2,830	1,268	44.8					
Fiscal year total	11,983	11,454	5,110	44.6					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for aid to dependent children for fiscal years 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter	725	687	256	37.3	1958—1st quarter	1,414	1,260	453	35.9
2d quarter	841	833	301	36.1	2d quarter	1,271	1,171	464	39.6
3d quarter	1,150	1,064	315	29.6	3d quarter	1,574	1,442	470	32.6
4th quarter	1,248	1,236	365	29.5	4th quarter	1,251	1,364	451	33.1
Fiscal year total	3,964	3,820	1,237	32.4	Fiscal year total	5,510	5,237	1,838	35.1

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to dependent children for fiscal years 1959-63 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter.....	1,554	1,314	457	34.7	1962—1st quarter.....	1,426	1,464	609	41.5
2d quarter.....	1,422	1,497	579	38.6	2d quarter.....	1,281	1,304	499	38.2
3d quarter.....	1,404	1,452	554	38.1	3d quarter.....	1,150	1,127	403	35.8
4th quarter.....	1,207	1,250	437	34.9	4th quarter.....	961	1,039	344	33.1
Fiscal year total.....	5,587	5,513	2,027	36.7	Fiscal year total.....	4,818	4,934	1,855	37.6
1960—1st quarter.....	1,509	1,256	452	35.9	1963—1st quarter.....	1,282	1,220	307	25.2
2d quarter.....	1,533	1,390	521	37.4	2d quarter.....	1,026	972	275	28.3
3d quarter.....	1,660	1,734	610	35.1	3d quarter.....	1,043	857	278	29.0
4th quarter.....	1,322	1,425	559	39.2	4th quarter.....	1,011	1,044	340	32.6
Fiscal year total.....	6,024	5,805	2,142	36.8	Fiscal year total.....	4,362	4,093	1,200	29.3
1961—1st quarter.....	1,450	1,386	542	39.1					
2d quarter.....	1,358	1,276	488	38.2					
3d quarter.....	1,664	1,553	575	37.0					
4th quarter.....	1,466	1,429	602	42.1					
Fiscal year total.....	5,938	5,644	2,207	39.1					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to the disabled, fiscal years 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter.....	314	325	234	72.0	1958—1st quarter.....	294	264	222	84.1
2d quarter.....	254	316	206	65.2	2d quarter.....	318	286	236	82.5
3d quarter.....	299	262	189	72.1	3d quarter.....	213	219	178	81.3
4th quarter.....	292	307	246	80.1	4th quarter.....	303	252	204	80.9
Fiscal year total.....	1,159	1,210	875	72.3	Fiscal year total.....	1,128	1,021	840	82.3

Number of applications, received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals, in aid to the disabled, fiscal years 1959-63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959—1st quarter.....	251	238	212	89.0	1962—1st quarter.....	167	165	143	86.6
2d quarter.....	266	289	191	66.0	2d quarter.....	210	253	232	91.6
3d quarter.....	292	279	239	85.6	3d quarter.....	349	206	184	83.3
4th quarter.....	367	371	292	78.7	4th quarter.....	537	614	593	96.6
Fiscal year total.....	1,176	1,177	934	79.3	Fiscal year total.....	1,263	1,238	1,152	93.1
1960—1st quarter.....	272	270	223	82.5	1963—1st quarter.....	313	347	326	93.9
2d quarter.....	233	251	202	80.4	2d quarter.....	264	254	243	95.7
3d quarter.....	357	361	286	79.2	3d quarter.....	286	281	268	95.4
4th quarter.....	399	393	306	77.8	4th quarter.....	286	267	217	81.3
Fiscal year total.....	1,266	1,275	1,017	79.7	Fiscal year total.....	1,149	1,149	1,054	91.7
1961—1st quarter.....	364	378	286	75.6					
2d quarter.....	276	250	210	84.0					
3d quarter.....	129	231	208	90.0					
4th quarter.....	160	189	151	79.8					
Fiscal year total.....	929	1,048	855	81.5					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for aid to the blind for fiscal year 1957 and 1958, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957—1st quarter.....	13	18	12	66.7	1958—1st quarter.....	13	13	7	53.8
2d quarter.....	8	20	10	50.0	2d quarter.....	16	11	9	81.8
3d quarter.....	26	14	7	50.0	3d quarter.....	16	15	5	33.3
4th quarter.....	16	24	10	41.7	4th quarter.....	14	15	10	66.7
Fiscal year total.....	63	76	39	51.3	Fiscal year total.....	59	54	31	57.4

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in aid to the blind, fiscal years 1959-63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959-1st quarter.....	19	15	7	46.6	1962-1st quarter.....	14	15	8	53.3
2d quarter.....	17	23	15	65.2	2d quarter.....	10	9	3	33.3
3d quarter.....	15	15	8	53.3	3d quarter.....	10	9	6	66.7
4th quarter.....	16	11	6	54.5	4th quarter.....	7	10	6	60.0
Fiscal year total...	67	64	36	56.2	Fiscal year total...	41	43	23	53.5
1960-1st quarter.....	20	16	9	56.2	1963-1st quarter.....	10	9	7	77.8
2d quarter.....	16	17	7	41.1	2d quarter.....	8	7	6	85.7
3d quarter.....	13	21	6	28.5	3d quarter.....	9	9	5	55.6
4th quarter.....	13	12	6	50.0	4th quarter.....	11	10	7	70.0
Fiscal year total...	62	66	28	42.4	Fiscal year total...	38	35	25	71.4
1961-1st quarter.....	12	12	7	58.3					
2d quarter.....	10	10	6	60.0					
3d quarter.....	15	10	5	50.0					
4th quarter.....	15	17	8	47.0					
Fiscal year total...	52	49	26	53.0					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved and percent of approvals in general public assistance, fiscal years 1957-58, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957-1st quarter.....	454	380	167	43.9	1958-1st quarter.....	889	837	276	32.9
2d quarter.....	663	613	195	31.8	2d quarter.....	819	714	354	49.6
3d quarter.....	922	785	249	31.7	3d quarter.....	988	967	342	35.4
4th quarter.....	925	972	242	24.9	4th quarter.....	962	1,002	431	43.0
Fiscal year total...	2,964	2,750	853	31.0	Fiscal year total...	3,658	3,520	1,403	39.9

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in general public assistance, fiscal years 1959-63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959-1st quarter.....	966	843	340	40.3	1962-1st quarter.....	1,015	1,022	451	44.1
2d quarter.....	868	928	405	43.6	2d quarter.....	839	849	322	37.9
3d quarter.....	902	993	445	44.8	3d quarter.....	869	880	386	43.9
4th quarter.....	767	794	326	41.0	4th quarter.....	780	758	298	39.3
Fiscal year total...	3,503	3,558	1,516	42.6	Fiscal year total...	3,503	3,509	1,457	41.5
1960-1st quarter.....	890	756	294	38.8	1963-1st quarter.....	748	727	241	33.1
2d quarter.....	901	791	349	44.1	2d quarter.....	715	647	234	36.2
3d quarter.....	961	896	358	39.9	3d quarter.....	746	767	242	31.6
4th quarter.....	727	876	334	38.1	4th quarter.....	698	681	221	32.5
Fiscal year total...	3,479	3,319	1,335	40.2	Fiscal year total...	2,907	2,822	938	33.2
1961-1st quarter.....	854	811	348	42.9					
2d quarter.....	886	832	385	46.2					
3d quarter.....	1,053	922	400	43.3					
4th quarter.....	949	885	396	44.7					
Fiscal year total...	3,742	3,450	1,529	44.3					

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals for old-age assistance, fiscal years 1957 and 1958 by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1957-1st quarter.....	384	352	129	36.6	1958-1st quarter.....	578	516	154	29.8
2d quarter.....	390	413	151	36.6	2d quarter.....	428	423	183	43.3
3d quarter.....	532	439	160	36.4	3d quarter.....	475	445	166	37.3
4th quarter.....	558	591	196	33.2	4th quarter.....	543	403	164	35.4
Fiscal year total...	1,854	1,795	636	35.4	Fiscal year total...	2,024	1,847	667	36.1

Number of applications received, disposed of, approved, and percent of approvals in old-age assistance, fiscal years 1959-63, by quarters

Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved		Year and quarter	Number of applications received	Number of applications disposed of	Applications approved	
			Number	Percent				Number	Percent
1959-1st quarter	502	450	171	38.0	1962-1st quarter	313	295	115	38.9
2d quarter	453	457	192	42.0	2d quarter	333	336	149	44.3
3d quarter	397	405	163	40.2	3d quarter	258	289	120	41.5
4th quarter	309	383	139	36.2	4th quarter	243	228	96	42.1
Fiscal year total	1,661	1,695	665	39.2	Fiscal year total	1,147	1,148	480	41.8
1960-1st quarter	330	306	116	37.9	1963-1st quarter	322	283	110	38.9
2d quarter	363	326	114	34.9	2d quarter	197	237	97	40.9
3d quarter	371	398	135	33.9	3d quarter	208	177	48	27.1
4th quarter	376	383	146	38.1	4th quarter	246	237	91	38.4
Fiscal year total	1,440	1,413	511	36.1	Fiscal year total	973	934	346	37.0
1961-1st quarter	370	342	154	45.0					
2d quarter	335	328	135	41.1					
3d quarter	290	283	93	32.8					
4th quarter	327	310	111	35.8					
Fiscal year total	1,322	1,263	493	39.0					

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point two resurveys of the ADC random sample and testimony, adduced during the hearings, interpreting and evaluating the resurveys.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESURVEY OF ADC RANDOM SAMPLE

Senator BYRD. This would probably be a good place, Mr. Brewer and Mr. Galvin, to comment on the resurvey of the ADC random sample. Now, we have just put into the record the survey of 50 cases which were not selected in a scientific manner but which were selected rather accidentally, and by hit-or-miss methods, I suppose. You have now conducted a resurvey, not just of a portion of the cases that were removed following the special investigation, but you have resurveyed all of the cases that were removed; is that correct?

Mr. GALVIN. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. So you have a 100-percent resurvey of the cases that were removed.

Mr. GALVIN. This could be projected for the whole caseload as it existed at the time of the sample selection. These are the 141 cases that were closed in the investigation of the random sample of the whole ADC caseload at that time. The results of the resurvey show as of the date of the survey, what would happen to that group of ineligible cases that were in the caseload at the time the sample was selected.

Senator BYRD. Now, at the time of the last hearing you presented the survey of a few of these families, I believe.

Mr. GALVIN. It was 23.

Senator BYRD. All right; 23, let us say. At that time, I suggested that you conduct a resurvey of the same 23 families and be prepared to present the results of the resurvey at the hearing this year. Now, you did better than this. You went beyond the 23 and you did a resurvey of 100 percent. You did a resurvey of the 141 cases, which is more than the committee asked for, but it certainly is pleasing to hear that you have resurveyed the entire group.

FINDINGS BASED ON RESURVEY

Now, what are your findings based on this resurvey? You already have addressed yourself to the findings with reference to the appeals. What are the additional findings?

Mr. GALVIN. Seventy-seven, or fifty-four percent, of the cases the clients were still living at the same address; 64 had moved to a new address. Of the 133 cases closed, 44—35 percent—had reapplied for assistance; 16—or 12 percent—of these applications were

approved; 25—or 19 percent—were rejected; and 5 or 4 percent were pending agency decision as of March 27. It was ascertained that rent had been paid for the month of January by 66 of the families, including 8 families whose cases had not been closed, and 13 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The January rent, and this was conducted in January, had not been paid by all—by 47 of the families. The rent situation in eight cases could not be determined. This is a bad photocopy. That is "86" instead of "66." The rent had been paid for the current month.

Senator BYRD. For the month in which—
Mr. GALVIN. For the month of the survey, the rents had been paid.

In the three families who had reapplied and been approved, two were delinquent only for the current month or the month of January, and the third was delinquent for 3 months. However, this client had been in arrears \$271 at the time of the prior investigation in December 1961, and is currently in arrears only \$222.50.

In the other 44 cases in which the rent is delinquent, the situation is as follows: 1 week or less—this is the delinquent rent—1 week or less, 4 families; 2 weeks or less, 2 families; 3 weeks, 1 family; 1 month, 24 families; 5 weeks, 1 family; 6 weeks, 2 families; 7 weeks, 1 family; 2 months, 5 families; 3 months, 4 families.

To recap that, 33, or 70 percent of the 47 who were delinquent in the rent, were in arrears only for the current month or for part of the current month; 65, or 56 percent of the 117 families not currently receiving assistance, were paid up to date on their rent; and 31, or 26 percent, were 1 month or less in arrears; 9, or 8 percent, were in arrears for 5 weeks to 2 months; 4, or 3 percent, in arrears for 3 months. And the rental situation could not be ascertained in 8, or 7 percent, of the cases.

CHILDREN IN JUNIOR VILLAGE

A complete list was obtained from the Child Welfare Division of all children placed at Junior Village between November 1961 and January 25, 1963. This list of 45 children with 14 families contains names of children whose placement in Junior Village is not as a direct result of the social worker's decision to close the case based on the investigative report.

For example, 2 children turned over to the Department, because the grantee relative no longer wanted to care for them: At the time of this report in January, 23 children were still at Junior Village. There are 2 cases in addition to the 141 which were continued on assistance, but the children were placed in Junior Village. In one of these cases, three children were placed in March

1962 and are still there. In the other case, two children were placed in September of 1962, and were later placed in foster homes where they still are.

Fifty of the 141 families are receiving surplus food. Only 31, or 26 percent, of the 117 cases not currently receiving public assistance are receiving surplus food. Of the 31, 21 families live at the same address, and 10 have moved; 86 not currently receiving public assistance are also not receiving surplus food; 41 of these families live at the same address, and 45 have moved.

(The information referred to follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,

March 27, 1963.

Memorandum to: Mr. Donald D. Brewer, Acting Director of Public Welfare.

Subject: Survey ADC random sample.

A survey was made in January 1963 to determine the status of 141 cases reported closed by Public Assistance Division of the cases investigated in the ADC random sample. According to a check made at registration and files, field administrative office in January 1963, 11 of these cases have not been closed. All other cases were closed no later than July 1962. A check with Public Assistance Division disclosed that 3 of these 11 should have been closed.

One had not been closed because the closing notice had not been sent to registration and files; however, no payment had been authorized since June 1962. One case had not been recorded as closed by registration and files although the closing notice had been sent there. The third case had been recorded as closed but incorrect information had been furnished OIC on the case status, due probably to the fact that the client had reapplied for assistance in September 1962 and is currently an active case.

Of the eight cases never closed, six were reinstated as a result of the appeal decision and two were not closed because of changes in the living situation of the clients.

It was ascertained that in 77 (54 percent) of the cases the clients were still living at the same address, including 5 of those cases which were never closed and 10 of the re-approved cases. Sixty-four had moved to a new address, including three of those never closed and six of the re-approved cases. The families that moved included six who moved out of town, one who is in prison, and two who are in the Department of Public Welfare Residential Training Center.

Of the 133 cases closed, 46 (35 percent) have reapplied for assistance; 16 (12 percent) of those applications were approved, 25 (19 percent) rejected and 5 (4 percent) are pending agency decision.

It was ascertained that rent had been paid for the month of January by 86 of the families, including 8 families whose cases have not been closed; on 13 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The January rent had not been paid by 47 of the families, including 3 who had reapplied and been approved for assistance. The rent situation in eight cases could not be determined.

In the three families who had reapplied and been approved, two were delinquent only for the current month and the third was delinquent for 3 months. This client had been in arrears \$271 at the time of the prior investigation in December 1961 and is currently in arrears \$222.50.

In the other 44 cases in which the rent is delinquent, the situation is as follows:

One week or less: Four families, including one owing a week's rent when the family moved out of the District and whose present address is unknown.

Two weeks: Two families.

Three weeks: One family.

One month: Fourteen families.

Five weeks: One family.

Six weeks: Two families.

Seven weeks: One family.

Two months: Five families, including one who moved out of the District in June 1962.

Three months: Four families, including one who moved out of the District in October 1962 and another who was in arrears at the time of the move. Neither of the present addresses are known.

Thirty-three (70 percent) of the 47 who were delinquent in the rent were in arrears only for the current month or for a part of the current month.

Sixty-five (56 percent) of the 117 families not currently receiving assistance were paid up to date on their rent and 31 (26 percent) were 1 month or less in arrears. Nine (8 percent) were in arrears for 5 weeks to 2 months, four (3 percent) in arrears for 3 months, and the rental situation could not be ascertained in eight (7 percent) cases.

A complete list was obtained from the Child Welfare Division of all children placed in Junior Village between November 1961 and January 25, 1963, whose cases were closed in the ADC random sample investigation. This list of 45 children from 14 families which is attached as schedule A, contains names of children whose placement in Junior Village is not as a direct result of the social worker's decision to close the case

based on the investigation report; e.g., two children turned over to the Department because the grantee relative no longer wanted to care for them. Twenty-three children are still at Junior Village.

There are two cases in the ADC random sample investigation which were continued on assistance but the children were placed in Junior Village. In one of the cases, three children were placed in March 1962 and are still there. In the other case, two children were placed in September 1962 and were later placed in foster homes where they still are.

Fifty of the 141 families are receiving surplus food. Included in this group are: Six of the eight families whose cases were never closed; 13 of the 16 reapplied cases; one of the five pending applications.

Only 31 (26 percent) of the 117 cases not currently receiving public assistance are receiving surplus food. Of the 31, 21 families live at the same address and 10 have moved. Eighty-six not currently receiving public assistance are also not receiving surplus food. Forty-one of these families live at the same address and 45 have moved.

WILLIAM R. GALVIN,
Investigations and Collections Officer.

ATTACHMENT A

Children placed in Junior Village whose cases were closed in ADC random sample investigation

Date of last check	Date case closed	Date placed in Junior Village	Number of children placed	Data released and to whom	Still at Junior Village	Remarks
Dec. 1, 1961	Feb. 6, 1962	Dec. 6, 1962	2	1 to District Training School on May 24, 1962.	1	Case closed but not as a result of special investigation project (SIP) report. Grantee relative no longer wanted to care for children and turned them over to Department.
Do	do	Mar. 7, 1962	2	May 1, 1962 to F.N.	0	Former recipient is currently employed and is not receiving surplus food. Her rent is 1 week (\$7) in arrears.
Feb. 1, 1962	Apr. 18, 1961	Mar. 16, 1962 Mar. 19, 1962	6 2		8	Mother was pregnant when she placed the children with Child Welfare Division. Mother has 3 children with her. She is living with paramour and father of several children. Recipient is not receiving surplus food. She has moved and the rent is paid up to date.
Apr. 2, 1962	May 8, 1962	June 6, 1962	6	1 on Dec. 14, 1962, to mother	5	Mother reapplied for assistance and was rejected on Oct. 31, 1962.
Mar. 1, 1962	Mar. 20, 1962	May 15, 1962 May 16, 1962	2 1	3 on Sept. 28, 1962, to mother	0	Recipient is not receiving surplus food and is living rent free in her new address.
Jan. 1, 1962	Apr. 16, 1962	May 10, 1962	2		2	Mother has been employed several years without notifying agency. Mother reapplied for assistance on May 23, 1962, but was rejected. Recipient is not receiving surplus food. She has moved to a different address where her rent is currently paid up. She is currently employed.
Feb. 1, 1962	Mar. 6, 1962	June 11, 1962	3	1 on Oct. 7, 1962, to mother; 2 on Dec. 23, 1962, to mother.	0	Reapplied for assistance. Rejected twice, May 23, 1962, and Oct. 10, 1962. Reapplied and was approved on Nov. 29, 1963. She was at the Department of Public Welfare Residential Training Center.
May 1, 1962	June 1, 1962	June 20, 1962	4	4 on July 13, 1962, to mother	0	Reapplied for assistance, and was rejected on Sept. 18, 1962. Recipient not receiving surplus food. She has moved and her rent is paid up to date.
Apr. 1, 1962	May 7, 1962	July 18, 1962	5	5 on Aug. 3, 1962, to mother	0	Reapplied for assistance on July 2, 1962, and approved on July 5, 1962.
May 1, 1962	May 31, 1962	July 30, 1962	3	1 on Oct. 22, 1962, to mother	2	Reapplied and was rejected on Dec. 21, 1962. Recipient is receiving surplus food. Has moved to a new address and is 1 month in arrears in her rent.
	May 3, 1962	Sept. 22, 1962	1	1 on Nov. 1, 1962, to mother	0	Recipient is not receiving surplus food and lives rent free with relatives. She is currently employed.
Feb. 1, 1962	Mar. 26, 1962	Oct. 24, 1962	2		2	Reapplied and was rejected on July 23, 1962; Aug. 27, 1962; and Sept. 28, 1962. Recipient is receiving surplus food. She has moved to a new address and her rent is paid up to date.
Apr. 1, 1962	Apr. 19, 1962	Jan. 7, 1963	1	1 on Jan. 29, 1963, to Central Union Mission.	0	Reapplied and was rejected Dec. 6, 1962. Recipient is not receiving surplus food.
June 1, 1962	May 4, 1962	Jan. 17, 1963	3		3	Recipient is not receiving surplus food. Has moved to a new address. Her rent is in arrears 1 month. She is living with a man at the new address.

Senator BYRD. Did you cover the resurvey, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. No. That was the January report.

RESURVEY, SEPTEMBER 1963

Now, the resurvey report dated September 24, 1963, was made during the month of August 1963. The status of the cases is as follows: 9, or 6.3 percent, were never closed and were continued on assistance; 101, or 71.7 percent, were closed and never reopened. One or 0.7 percent was closed but was reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and

again closed prior to December 1, 1962. Five cases, or 3.6 percent, were closed, reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and again closed after December 31, 1962.

Ten cases, or 7.1 percent, were closed at the time of the special investigation and were reopened prior to December 31, 1962, and are still active.

Fifteen cases, or 10.6 percent, were closed, then were reopened after December 31, 1962, and still active. So, of the 141, there are currently on assistance 34 cases.

I also have code reasons for closing, which I will supply for the record.

(The material referred to follows:)

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,

September 24, 1963.

Memorandum to: Mr. Donald D. Brewer,

Acting Director of Public Welfare.

Subject: Resurvey ADC random sample.

Reference is made to survey made in January 1963 of the status of 141 cases as reported closed in the ADC random sample, as reported to you by letter March 27, 1963.

A resurvey of the 141 cases of the ADC random sample reported closed as a result of the special investigation project to determine their current status was made August 1963. Results are as follows:

Status of cases

	Number of cases	Percent
Never closed, continued on assistance.....	9	6.3
Closed, never reopened.....	101	71.7
Closed, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, and again closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962.....	1	.7
Closed, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, and again closed after Dec. 31, 1962.....	5	3.6
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, still active.....	10	7.1
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened after Dec. 31, 1962, still active.....	15	10.6

Code reasons for closing

Of the 132 cases closed, code reasons for initial closing are as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
01.....	1
03.....	1
04.....	6
11.....	2
12.....	1
21.....	1
22.....	1
33.....	1
35.....	2
37.....	1
41.....	1
53.....	1
54.....	2
71.....	1
72.....	6
73.....	12
74.....	5
76.....	5
79.....	52
90.....	8
92.....	1
93.....	1
94.....	19
Subtotal.....	131
None.....	1
Total.....	132

NOTE.—Not closed in registration and files.

Of the 101 cases closed never reopened, code reasons for closing were as follows:

Code:	Number of cases
01.....	1
04.....	6
11.....	1
12.....	1
21.....	1
22.....	1
33.....	1
35.....	2
37.....	1
41.....	1
53.....	1
54.....	2
71.....	1
72.....	5
73.....	9
74.....	4
76.....	4
79.....	39
90.....	6
92.....	1
94.....	12
Total.....	101

Code reasons for closing, six cases closed, reopened, and again closed.

Number of cases	Code, original closing	Code, 2d closing
1.....	03	73
1.....	74	11
3.....	79	04, 79, 94
1.....	94	79

Code reason for closing 25 cases originally closed, again reopened, and still active:

Code:	Number of cases
11.....	1
72.....	1
73.....	3
76.....	1
79.....	10
90.....	2
93.....	1
94.....	6

Appeal hearings

Thirty-one (22 percent) of the 141 cases requested appeal hearings, with results as follows:

Agency sustained:	Number of cases
Never closed.....	1
Closed, never reopened.....	10
Closed and reopened prior to Dec. 31, 1962, still active.....	1
Closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, reopened after Dec. 31, 1962, still active.....	1
Total (41.9 percent of 31).....	13

Agency action not sustained:

Never closed, still on assistance.....	Number of cases
Continued on assistance, closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962.....	1
Continued on assistance, closed prior to Dec. 31, 1962, again approved, and again closed after Dec. 31, 1962.....	1
Total (22.6 percent of 31).....	7

Withdrawals:

Closed, never reopened.....	Number of cases
Closed and reopened prior to December 1962, currently active.....	5
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened after December 1962, still active.....	1
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened prior to December 1962, and closed prior to December 1962.....	1
Total (29 percent of 31).....	9

Failed to appear:

Closed prior to December 1962, never reopened.....	Number of cases
Closed prior to December 1962, reopened prior to December 1962, still active.....	1
Total (6.5 percent of 31).....	2

Reapplications

Of the 132 cases closed, 59 recipients (44.4 percent) made 88 reapplications as follows:

	1 time	2 times	3 times	4 times	Total applicants	Total number of reapplications	Pending
Never reopened.....	20	6	1	1	28	39	3
Reopened after.....	15	4	4	1	24	43	
Closed, reopened after reapplication, again closed.....	6				6	6	
Total.....	41	10	5	2	58	88	3

Children admitted to Junior Village

Case	Date admitted	Number	Date discharged	Number	Discharged to—	Still at Junior Village
Parent still on assistance:						
1.....	December 1961.....	2	May 24, 1962.....	1	D.T.S.....	0
2.....	January 1963.....	3	Apr. 25, 1963.....	1	F.H.....	3
3.....	September 1962.....	1	November 1962.....	1	Mother.....	0
4.....	May 1962.....	2	March 1963.....	2	W.T.C.....	0
5.....	July 1962.....	5	August 1962.....	5	Mother.....	0
6.....	June 1962.....	4		4	T.C.....	0
Total.....		17		14		3
Parent not on assistance:						
1.....	January 1963.....	3	January 1962.....	1	F.H.....	3
2.....	June 1962.....	3	February 1962.....	2	Mother.....	0
3.....	March 1962.....	2	May 1962.....	2	F.H.....	0
4.....	do.....	8	March 1963.....	8	Mother.....	0
5.....	January 1963.....	1	January 1963.....	1	C.U. Mission.....	0
6.....	July 1962.....	3	January 1962.....	1		0
			February 1963.....	1	Mother.....	0
			July 1963.....	1		4
7.....	June 1962.....	6	December 1962.....	1	Mother.....	0
			June 1963.....	1	do.....	0
8.....	October 1962.....	2	March 1963.....	2	Mother.....	3
9.....	May 1962.....	3	September 1962.....	3		4
10.....	March 1963.....	3				
11.....	February 1963.....	4				
Total.....		38		24		14
Not part of 141:						
1.....	September 1962.....	2	December 1962.....	2	F.H.....	0
2.....	March 1962.....	3		1	CCH NH Tng.....	2
Total.....		5		3		2

Residence and rental

Of the 141 cases, 67 (47.1 percent) are still residing at the same address, 73 (51.4 percent) have changed their addresses, and one is deceased. Residence and rental information is as follows:

	Number of cases
On assistance, same address (12.9 percent).....	18
Rent payments, current.....	17
Delinquent (2 1/2 months).....	1
Average.....	\$67.50
Smallest.....	45.00
Largest.....	115.00
On assistance, new address (11.5 percent).....	16
Rent payments, current.....	9
Delinquent (1/2 month, 1 month, 2 months).....	3
Average rental unknown (hospital).....	1
Rent free.....	3
Average.....	\$69.80
Smallest.....	60.00
Largest.....	100.00
Not on assistance, same address (34.5 percent).....	49
Rent payments, current (77.6 percent).....	38
Delinquent (1 and 2 months) (18.3 percent).....	9
Rent free (4.1 percent).....	2
Average.....	\$55.85
Smallest.....	31.00
Largest.....	110.00
Not on assistance, new address (40.2 percent).....	57
Rent payments, current (50.9 percent).....	29
Delinquent (12.3 percent).....	7
Rent free (10.5 percent).....	6
Loss of contact (26.3 percent).....	15
Average.....	\$68.30
Smallest.....	33.00
Largest.....	135.00
Deceased (0.7 percent).....	1

Rental ranges

Figures available on 112 of 141 cases:
On assistance, same address, 18 of 18.
On assistance, new address, 12 of 16 (3 rent free, 1 unknown).
No longer on assistance, same address, 47 of 49 (2 rent free).
No longer on assistance, new address, 35 of 58 (16 unknown, 6 rent free, 1 deceased).

All	Active same address	Active new address	Closed same address	Closed new address	Total
30 to 40.....			14	4	18
41 to 50.....	2		5	4	11
51 to 60.....	3	2	8	8	21
61 to 70.....	7	8	10	5	30
71 to 80.....	4		6	5	15
81 to 90.....	1	1	2	2	6
91 to 100.....		1	1	4	6
101 to 110.....			1	1	2
111 to 120.....	1			1	2
121 to 130.....					
131 to 140.....				1	1
Total.....	18	12	47	35	112

Living arrangements

	Number
Living with husband or paramour:	
On assistance.....	4
Off assistance.....	28
Living alone:	
On assistance.....	22
Off assistance.....	39
With friends or relative:	
On assistance.....	6
Off assistance.....	25
Unknown:	
On assistance.....	0
Off assistance.....	14
Hospital:	
On assistance.....	1
Off assistance.....	1
Deceased.....	1
Total.....	141

Employment

Employed:	
On assistance.....	3
Not on assistance.....	51
Subtotal.....	54
Unemployed:	
On assistance.....	28
Not on assistance.....	42
Subtotal.....	70
Unknown, could not be determined at time of survey:	
On assistance.....	4
Not on assistance.....	13
Subtotal.....	17
Total.....	106

Recap

	To Junior Village	Discharged from Junior Village	Still at Junior Village
Parent still on assistance.....	17	14	3
Parent off assistance.....	38	24	14
Not part of 141.....	5	3	2
Total.....	60	41	19

Free lunch program

Total families with school age children living in Washington.....	107
Number of families on assistance, participating.....	11
Number of families on assistance, not participating.....	15
Subtotal.....	26
Number of families, off assistance, participating.....	16
Number of families off assistance, not participating.....	15
Subtotal.....	81

No information could be obtained at time of resurvey as to ages of children, or participation in program on seven of the families on assistance and eight families off assistance. Remaining families either not in Washington or have no school age children.

Surplus foods

Certified for surplus food:	
On assistance.....	19
Off assistance.....	21
Total.....	40
Not certified for surplus food:	
On assistance.....	15
Off assistance.....	86
Total.....	101

86 of the recipients now off assistance rolls, not currently certified for surplus food, but previously certified..... 84
Never certified..... 2
Total..... 86

WILLIAM R. GALVIN,**Investigations and Collections Officer.**

Mr. GALVIN. On appeals—
Senator BYRD. Pardon me. Of the 141, how many are currently on assistance?
Mr. GALVIN. Nine plus ten plus fifteen, thirty-four.
Senator BYRD. Of which 25 were closed.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.
Senator BYRD. And reopened later.
Mr. GALVIN. And have been reopened.

APPEALS

There were 31 appeals, or 22 percent, of the 141 closed cases which requested appeal hearings with results as follows.

Senator BYRD. Did we not have these already given?

Mr. GALVIN. This is bringing it up to date for August 1963. The other report was for January 1963.

Senator BYRD. That was not September?

Mr. BREWER. I believe I was reading from the January report. The one I handed to the chairman.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes. This is the September report.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. GALVIN. Agency sustained in 13 or 41.9 percent. Agency action not sustained in seven or 22.6 percent. Withdrawals after they had requested the appeal, nine or 29 percent. Failed to appear, two or 6.5 percent.

DISPOSITION OF CLOSED CASES

Of the 141 cases that were reported closed at the end of the random sample, 9 had been reported as closed but never were closed. Of the 132 actually closed, 59 recipients or 44.4 percent have reapplied, resulting in, as of the time of this report, 25 being put back on assistance.

Senator BYRD. That is the same 25 we earlier—

Mr. GALVIN. That is the same 25 we earlier referred to.

Senator BYRD. In other words, they took action to remove the elements of ineligibility. Is that right?

Mr. GALVIN. It is always possible on public assistance, that the circumstances do change and that the cause for which they became ineligible has been removed or the situation has so changed that they are apparently eligible for assistance.

Sixty-seven or 47.1 percent are still residing at the same address. Seventy-three or 51.4 percent have changed their address. And one is deceased.

RENTAL SITUATION PER CASES

Eighteen or 12.9 percent are on assistance and living at the same address.

In 17 of these the rent payments are completely up to date and in 1 they are in arrears. Sixteen or 11.5 percent are on assistance and are now at a new address; of these nine have current rent payments; three are delinquent; one, the rental is unknown, and three are living rent free with relatives.

Of the 49 or 39.5 percent not on assistance and living at the same address, 38 are current in their rental payments.

Senator BYRD. Or 77.6 percent.

Mr. GALVIN. Or 77.6 percent. Nine, or 18.3 percent, are delinquent. Two, or 4.1 percent, are rent free.

Senator BYRD. Nine are delinquent from 1 to 2 months.

Mr. GALVIN. That is right.

Of the 57 or 40.2 percent not on assistance and living at a new address, 29, or 50.9 percent, are current in their rental payments. Seven, or 12.6 percent, are delinquent. Six, or 10.5 percent, are living rent free. And with 15, or 26.3 percent, there is no contact. And one, or 0.7 percent, is deceased.

CHECKS ON EMPLOYMENT

On employment, as far as we could verify employment, of the 106 not on assistance, 51 or 48.1 percent are employed, 42 or 39.2 percent are unemployed, and 13 or 12.3 percent employment cannot be determined.

Of the 35 on assistance, employed were 3 or 8.6 percent and this is part-time employment. Unemployed were 28 or 80 percent.

Employment could not be determined in four cases, or 11.4 percent.

FAMILIES ON SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

On the elementary school free lunch program, the total families with school-age children living in Washington are 107. Eleven of these families on assistance are participating and 15 families on assistance are not participating in the free lunch program. Sixteen of the families that are not receiving assistance are participating and 65 are not participating in the free lunch program.

We couldn't obtain information at the time of our resurvey as to the ages of the children or participation in program of seven of the families on assistance and eight families off of assistance.

FAMILIES RECEIVING SURPLUS FOOD

On surplus food, 19 or 13.5 percent on assistance were certified for surplus food and 21 or 14.9 percent not on assistance were certified.

Fifteen or 10.6 percent on assistance were not certified for surplus food and 86 or 61 percent not receiving assistance were not certified for surplus food, making a total of 141.

Senator BYRD. The followthrough study was made in August, was it, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir. The first one was made in July 1962. The second one in January 1963, and the third one, from which I just read, was made in August 1963.

Senator BYRD. Can you summarize in a general way what these surveys and resurveys show as far as the 141 families are concerned, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. It shows that the economic situation does change in some of the families to the degree that they become eligible again for public assistance after a year or so. This was the situation for 25 of the families. Of the remaining 107, most of them have economic resources which we didn't go into too deeply because this would have required a much longer investigation. Most of them have economic resources and are able to pay their rent.

I made a statement at the last hearing about surplus food that I wouldn't like to make now because the fact that they do not get surplus food to me no longer indicates that they are not eligible for it. It could be that they are not aware that they could receive it.

JUNIOR VILLAGE SITUATION

The Junior Village situation also proves that the economic situation has not deteriorated. The number at Junior Village is decreasing rather than increasing.

The first economic indicator based on my experience with the Department that shows deterioration of the economic situation is in rent. This they allow to go delinquent and use the money for other needs, until they are forced to move or are evicted. The rental situation I think is particularly important in terms of showing that the economic situation is not severe in most closed cases.

Now, as we found in our first survey, as we have found in each one of the surveys, there are cases that you do run into that very definitely should be back on public assistance or need the help of a social welfare agency.

Senator BYRD. I suppose they are reflected in the 25.

Mr. GALVIN. These are reflected in the 25. Senator BYRD. That went back?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right.

AVERAGE TIME PER CASE IN INVESTIGATION

Senator BYRD. What is the average time spent on the investigation of a case?

Mr. GALVIN. This varies from case to case. Thirty-one for adult review, and we had estimated 30 for intake. We found that intake takes a little bit longer, average 33

hours. The reason that it takes a little bit longer in intake is that the applicants are very much aware that they are going to be investigated within the first month or two.

Senator BYRD. What would the 33 hours mean in terms of dollars and cents, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. Our average investigator is a GS-7. This is a pay scale of \$5,540 a year, and I would have to divide that to see how many hours this would take. I can do that in a couple of minutes.

In terms of investigative time, it is \$88.11.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, by Mr. Joseph Meyers, of the Social Security Administration, during hearings last year on the fiscal year 1963 appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

(Statement of Joseph Meyers, Deputy Commissioner, Social Security Administration)

CLOSED CASES IN 1960

Mr. MEYERS. My name is Joseph Meyers, and I am Deputy Commissioner of the Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Senator BYRD. Referring further to the reasons for closing cases in fiscal year 1960, I would like to ask you this question:

Three hundred and eighty-two ADC cases were closed because of employment or increased earnings.

Would such closings be in violation of a Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. As a matter of fact, if there are adequate earnings and adequate income in the family, the Federal act requires that the cases be closed.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Ninety cases were closed because of support by relatives.

Would closing a case on this basis be in violation of a Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. Assuming actual support was coming from relatives, there would be no problem there.

Senator BYRD. Thirty cases were closed because of service-connected income.

Would any Federal statute have been violated in the course of closing these cases for this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. The possession of adequate income from whatever source would not—

Senator BYRD. Would you repeat that, please?

Mr. MEYERS. The possession of adequate income from any source would be an appropriate basis for closing a case under the Federal requirements.

Senator BYRD. Fifty-three cases were closed because of acquisition of other resources.

Would any Federal statute have been violated because of the closing of ADC cases, on this basis?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Thirty-three cases were closed in the ADC category because of the remarriage of the parent.

Was any Federal statute violated because of these cases having been closed for this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. I think not. If I understand the category, the case is closed and is ineligible on the basis of the fact that there is a husband and wife and, presumably, the husband is employable.

The District of Columbia eligibility does not extend to families with employable male heads. If that is the basis for the closing I

would say that it does not run into any problem in terms of the Federal requirement.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, do you have any comment?

Mr. SHEA. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. I think this would fall under the provisions that Mr. Meyers just stated, that he presumed correctly that this is a mother who has remarried and, therefore, there is an employable male person in the home.

Senator BYRD. One case was closed on the basis of admittance to an institution.

Would this be in violation of any Federal statute, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Fifteen cases were closed on the basis of the recipients' having moved out of the District.

Would this be in conflict with any Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. I would have to answer that under ordinary circumstances, "No, sir."

There are certain residence requirements in the Federal law which would require under certain circumstances people who have moved, but who had not really lost their residence, to have assistance continued.

But assuming that they had given up their residence, that would present no problem.

Senator BYRD. Is Mr. Meyers correct in his assumption, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. He is correct in his assumption, and this is provided for in the departmental regulations.

These will fall under those requirements. Senator BYRD. 116 cases were closed because of loss of contact.

Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated thereby?

Mr. MEYERS. I think I need a little more explanation of what is meant by that.

MEANING OF PHRASE "LOSS OF CONTACT"

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, would you care to give an explanation of what is meant by "loss of contact," either you or Mr. Galvin?

Mr. SHEA. Mr. Galvin will, I believe.

Mr. GALVIN. "Loss of contact" means that the person or the whereabouts of the person is no longer known to the Department. There is a 60-day limit before they close the cases in this situation.

Mr. Scholz would know the exact requirements on this.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Scholz, would you care to state the exact requirements?

Mr. SCHOLZ. It means, sir, that the check of the client has been returned with a notation that he is not at the address where we believed him to be and that he has a 2-month period before the case is closed.

We do not know where to get in touch with him.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, now would you care to comment?

Was any Federal statute violated?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. We would expect the District or any department, in cases where they are unable to determine the whereabouts of the person who has been on assistance, to hold up the assistance until such time as they could determine where the person was.

FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH AGENCY POLICY

Senator BYRD. Forty-one cases were removed from the ADC category because of refusal to comply with agency policy.

Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated because of the removal of cases for this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. It is pretty difficult to tell, Mr. Chairman.

Certainly a failure to comply with agency policy, which would mean that the person did not meet some requirement, would not cause any problem.

It would be necessary, of course, in order to give a complete answer, to know what the policies were, because as to whether the policies themselves, which were violated, would create a problem, I could not say.

But as to a policy which in and of itself is all right, a failure to comply with it on the part of a recipient would certainly be adequate reason as far as the Federal Government is concerned for closing a case.

CLARIFICATION OF CASE CLOSING

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, would you or Mr. Galvin clarify the meaning of this basis for closing a case, "refusal or failure to comply with agency policy"?

Mr. SHEA. Could we have Mr. Scholz speak on that?

Senator BYRD. I will ask Mr. Galvin first.

Mr. GALVIN. "Refusal to comply with agency policy?"

The agency's policies are written procedures. They are submitted to HEW by letter so that HEW is thoroughly familiar with what our policies are.

Failure to cooperate means refusal to give information that is necessary to make a determination on resources or eligibility. Under this would fall refusal to take a medical examination to determine employability, refusal to clarify resources, or refusal to permit investigation into a bank account that is known to the agency.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Scholz, would you care to elaborate further?

Mr. SCHOLZ. There is nothing I could add, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Thank you.

Now, Mr. Meyers, would you care to comment further?

Mr. MEYERS. Closing for failure to comply with a policy on all of the illustrations given by Mr. Galvin, in my mind, would not raise a question.

CASES CLOSED ON BASIS OF EMPLOYABILITY

Senator BYRD. All right. Fifty-one cases were closed on the basis of employability.

What do we mean by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. That the person is able to work.

Senator BYRD. Which person?

Mr. SHEA. The head of the household is able to work.

Senator BYRD. Is this the woman or the man?

Mr. SHEA. Yes.

Senator BYRD. Either case?

Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. And in ADC we have the provision that there must be an adequate and satisfactory child-care plan.

Senator BYRD. Before the case can be closed?

Mr. GALVIN. Before the case can be closed. Senator BYRD. For reasons of employability?

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, was any Federal statute violated as a result of 51 ADC cases having been closed, on this basis?

Mr. MEYERS. My understanding is that our Department has approved and accepted the District of Columbia plan under which cases, where there are employable people, are not eligible; we have accepted that, as I understand the present arrangement.

VOLUNTARY WITHDRAWALS

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, you have with you Mr. Yourman. At any time, if you care to ask him further questions you may feel free to do so.

Eighty-three cases were eliminated from the ADC category on the basis of voluntary withdrawal.

Mr. MEYERS. Do you see any conflict with Federal statutes in the action taken?

Mr. MEYERS. Not as such. Certainly, we would all have to recognize that any individual has the right, and must have the right, to truly, on a voluntary basis, decide that he does not want to be an applicant for or a recipient of assistance.

So there is no problem certainly from our point with anyone who voluntarily withdraws his application for assistance.

Senator BYRD. Sixty-four cases were withdrawn for reasons of the recipient's being no longer incapacitated. "No longer incapacitated."

Before we ask Mr. Meyers to comment on this, Mr. Shea, would you explain what is meant here?

Mr. SHEA. This would mean that a person had been found incapacitated by a medical team after the medical review, in all probability, and would have been on the aid-to-the-disabled category after or—or it could, temporarily, on the GPA category.

This person could, by rehabilitative efforts on the part of, for example, the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation or general hospitals, have eliminated the incapacitative factor, whatever it might have been, and, therefore, was no longer incapacitated and, therefore, was able to carry on, maybe not necessarily the same type of work at which he previously had been employed but, at least, was employable later.

ELABORATION OF TERM "NO LONGER INCAPACITATED"

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, the reason here is expressed thusly: "No longer incapacitated."

Would you care to elaborate beyond what Mr. Shea elaborated?

Mr. GALVIN. As he mentioned, this incapacitation is in all categories.

In the ADC category you have an applicant who may be approved for ADC because of absence, death, or incapacitation of the parent.

In these cases incapacitation was the original reason for approval and now this condition no longer exists and they are now employable.

Therefore, since the reason has been removed, they are no longer eligible for assistance.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, now would you care to comment as to whether or not the 64 ADC cases, which were removed in fiscal year 1960, on the basis of the parents being no longer incapacitated were removed in violation of the Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir; there is no question, if a case is made eligible by reason of a physical condition—that is the incapacity according to the State definition—and they determine that that condition no longer exists or has been sufficiently improved to take them out of the category, there is no problem.

Senator BYRD. One hundred and forty-six cases were removed because the absent father returned and employable. I suppose it should be "and was employable."

The reason given is "absent father returned and employable." Perhaps you are referring to two different groupings.

CLARIFICATION OF TERM "ABSENT FATHER RETURNED AND EMPLOYABLE"

Mr. Shea, would you clarify what is meant by "absent father returned and employable"? Or you can call on anybody else you want to.

Mr. SHEA. This situation could be illustrated: A man could have been incarcerated. The period of his imprisonment has been completed and he returned home and he is able to work.

The District of Columbia does not aid the unemployed. He may actually be unemployed but employable and, therefore, he would be ineligible.

A man may have been, by the cooperative efforts of the Public Welfare Department, in two cities, together with the counterpart of the Corporation Counsel's Office, in another city and the man returns to this jurisdiction, came back into the family situation.

Previously he may not have been supporting the family. And now he is back in the jurisdiction. He is with his family. He is able to work.

He has returned to the situation and, therefore, his absence obviously is no longer the reason for the case having been opened.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, would you care to elaborate further?

I will read it again: "Absent father returned and employable."

Mr. GALVIN. The original reason for approval was absence of the father. The father has now returned to the home situation.

So the absence question has been removed. The fact that he is employable removes the incapacity question and, therefore, under the District's rules he is no longer eligible.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, were the 146 cases, for this reason, removed from the ADC category in violation of the Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. Again, Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak to the particular facts, but on the basis of the reasons given, that type of eligibility condition and closing because of it does not cause any Federal problem.

Senator BYRD. Included in these 146 cases were 64 cases in which continued absence of the man was not established.

What is meant by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. "Continued absence of the man?"

In other words, after the Department's investigating force began to make its surveillance and investigation into the situation it was ascertained, rather than the man being continuously absent, he may have been actually continuously present.

So, in other words, his absence—the absence factor has been discredited and he, therefore, was present and, therefore, the case was not eligible.

ABSENCE OF MAN AS FACTOR

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, there were 64 cases in the group of 146 in which continued absence of a man was not established.

Will you explain what is meant?

Mr. GALVIN. The original approval was based on absence of the parent. This is no longer true and so the case is no longer eligible.

Senator BYRD. What is no longer true?

Mr. GALVIN. That the parent is absent. The parent has returned to the home.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, was the removal of 64 cases, included in this category, removed because of continued absence of the man not being established, in violation of Federal statutes?

Mr. MEYERS. I would have no question about closing a case on the basis of credible evidence that the man was not actually absent.

Senator BYRD. Thirty-nine cases were removed from the ADC category because the child reached the maximum age.

Mr. Shea, what is the maximum age?

Mr. SHEA. The maximum age, if the child is in school, is 18. If the child has been dropped from school it is 16.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, was a Federal statute violated as a result of 39 cases having been removed from the ADC category on this basis?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-seven cases were closed because the child was placed in foster care.

Would this be in conflict with the Federal statute, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. The child would, in that case, no longer be living with the relative which would establish eligibility under the ADC category, and that would be an appropriate closing.

Senator BYRD. Ninety-four cases were closed because the child was not deprived of parental support.

What is meant here by that, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. In other words, this means that there is income coming into the family situation, so that the needs of the family are provided for by the regular income of the man from employment.

Senator BYRD. Anything further you would add, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. No, sir.

The three grounds for approval are absence, death, and incapacitation.

Here no one is deprived. So, therefore, he would not be eligible.

FURTHER QUESTION OF CONFLICT WITH FEDERAL STATUTE

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you find anything here to be in conflict with the Federal statutes?

Mr. MEYERS. No question is raised in the closing of any case on the basis of the existence of adequate resources to meet the needs of the family.

Senator BYRD. Do you find, Mr. Meyers, that the removal of the cases because the child was not deprived of parental support, was in violation of the Federal statutes?

Mr. MEYERS. If the removal was, as stated by the two District witnesses, on the basis of resources, actual support being furnished, there would be no question; no, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, would you care to comment further?

Mr. GALVIN. The question of resources does not enter the picture here.

The District provides that absence, death, or incapacitation of the parent may approve a child for ADC.

Conversely, the presence of or the employability of the parent, makes the child ineligible for approval under District of Columbia regulations. The question of resources or whether or not the man is employed does not enter into this picture.

If a case—

Senator BYRD. Pardon me, but you do not mean that, do you, "whether or not he is employed"?

Mr. GALVIN. If a man is employable, the question of whether or not he is employed does not enter into the picture.

Senator BYRD. Yes, excuse me.

Mr. GALVIN. If we have a case, for example, where the man is incapacitated, regardless of his marital status if he was the supporting factor in the case—for example, he could be a common law husband or paramour or a legal husband or anything—if he were incapacitated and in the family group he could be considered in the assistance group and assistance granted.

Conversely, if he becomes employable, similar to the employable husband, the family then would no longer be eligible.

So the question of resources was not true.

Senator BYRD. So once again "the child was not deprived of parental support."

VIOLATION OF FEDERAL STATUTE

Mr. MEYERS. Did the District of Columbia act in violation of a Federal statute in removing cases from the ADC category for this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. Again, I have some confusion in my mind about the differences in some of these categories as they were explained.

If again we are talking about the actual presence in the home of someone who has assumed this parental role, this is one thing, and I see no problem with it.

I think the reason I have a problem and why I equated it with "resources" immediately was that I do not understand the difference between this category of closing and the one where the parent is continuously present or where he isn't absent.

If it is on the basis of absence, then I do not know what the different flavor is to this particular closing.

Senator BYRD. Can you distinguish between the two, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. Under Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regulations, statistically, cases are grouped into two sections:

One is the requirement of need, and the other is a no-need requirement, and we are really talking about, in the first group that we mentioned, that they fall under the need

group and, in the second group, they fall under the no-need group.

Mr. LAJEWSKI is thoroughly familiar with this, and I think he could explain this much more thoroughly than I could.

Senator BYRD. Well, it may have been explained now to Mr. Meyers' satisfaction.

If it has not been, I would like to ask Mr. LAJEWSKI to comment further, Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. Well, I must confess that I am not exactly clear on what is contained in this particular subitem as the basis for closing.

Senator BYRD. Mr. LAJEWSKI, can you help us?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I think that the dilemma that Mr. Meyers finds himself in is a correct one.

Since that report was prepared—this is 1960—we have included these cases under the continued absence policy.

Senator BYRD. I see. Does that help?

Mr. MEYERS. That does help, and if these are presence and absence cases they present no problem.

Senator BYRD. All right.

CATEGORY IDENTIFIED AS "OTHER"

Now, Mr. Shea, the only remaining category of case closings is under the word "other." Will you explain what is included in this category?

Mr. SHEA. I will have to call on Mr. LAJEWSKI again on this "other" word.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, you might find me in a dilemma here because I have the report for 1962, and all of the categories that you have been referring to are clearcut in here, but I also have a remainder of "other," reasons. Thirty-three cases were closed for this reason in 1962.

I cannot clarify "other" reasons at this time. These are very miscellaneous reasons, and this would be difficult without analyzing the individual cases to see what the specific reason is.

Senator BYRD. Could you give us an example?

Could you give an example of one which does not fall within the categories already enumerated?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I am not prepared for that, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea or Mr. Galvin, can you?

Mr. GALVIN. I think if he would enumerate his 33 in 1962, this would help us.

Senator BYRD. Well, we are going to come along with 1961 in a few minutes.

Mr. GALVIN. I mean, as far as reasons are concerned. He said he had the reasons.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I think that Mr. Galvin misunderstood.

At the end of this listing I have "other reasons," which are not enumerated, and, as I stated, I am not prepared to indicate what those specific reasons are.

We would have to make an analysis of those particular cases.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Scholz, can you help us?

We obviously cannot expect Mr. Meyers to comment on this category if we cannot reveal to him what is meant by "other reasons."

Mr. Scholz?

Mr. SCHOLZ. I am afraid not, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. Perhaps I can help. Under "other" are any cases which do not fall within the groups you have previously outlined in detail, and it does not include any case closed because of unsuitability.

Perhaps that would help.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, does this help to the point that you can comment on this category?

Mr. MEYERS. Well, I think not. It helps to the extent that Mr. Galvin says that it does not include any case which would involve a question of suitability or unsuitability.

As to what the others are, we do not know, and I think I really cannot comment.

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. Shea, can we find some way of clarifying this today?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. We will look into some kind of a sample of the closings and get it.

Senator BYRD. Give us a number of examples, if you can, in the afternoon.

This is the only remaining category that I find which needs clarification in the table for fiscal 1960.

POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REGULATIONS WITH FEDERAL STATUTES

Now let's go to fiscal year 1961. This is a laborious, time-consuming procedure, but I think it is highly important, because we are about to appropriate money for the next fiscal year, which has already begun, of course, and if the District of Columbia regulations are in conflict with the Federal statutes, this would obviously mean that there would have to be some revisions of budget estimates.

So it is important to have a determination of whether or not they are in violation, and if they are not, then we can proceed to appropriate on the basis of the estimates that have been presented.

Now, in fiscal year 1961, table 5 on pages 6 and 7 of the Annual Report of Fiscal Year 1961, Department of Public Welfare, District of Columbia, we find these reasons for closing cases.

I will insert the table at this point in the record.

(The table referred to appears on p. 2471.)

REASONS FOR CLOSING CASES IN 1961

Senator BYRD. First of all, let me state that the total number of ADC cases closed was 1,371. We will go through the same procedure, Mr. Meyers, although you have already answered the questions, I think, but let's leave nothing in doubt and nothing to chance.

Transferred to another assistance program were 18 cases.

Was any Federal statute violated here?

Mr. MEYERS. As a requirement, that is unobjectionable.

Senator BYRD. One case was closed because of death; 201 cases were closed because there was a material change in the income or resources, specifically because of the employment or the increased earnings of the ADC father.

Mr. Meyers, would you have any objection to this?

Mr. MEYERS. No; if it is established that additional income adequate to meet the needs under the District's standard exists, there is no problem.

Senator BYRD. 212 cases were closed because of the employment, or because of increased earnings of the ADC mother.

Mr. Meyers, do you have any objection to this reason for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. I think my answer to the previous question would be equally applicable to that, sir.

Senator BYRD. Two cases were closed because of the employment or increased earnings of the ADC child.

Was this in conflict with a Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. No, I would—I think it would be helpful, though, if we would know the basis in the District—I am not familiar with it—for taking into account income of the particular family members.

If we assume that the policy is that income of any of the family members, including the child and everyone else, is lumped into a standard budget, and you figure the needs and resources of all, this certainly would be an appropriate basis for closing a case.

Senator BYRD. Would be an appropriate basis?

Mr. MEYERS. Would be an appropriate basis.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Mr. Meyers has made the correct assumption with respect to the District policy.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. I agree with Mr. Shea.

OTHER PERSON PARTICIPATION

Senator BYRD. Two cases were closed because of the employment or increased earnings of other person.

Mr. Shea, would you care to explain what is meant by other person?

Mr. SHEA. This could be bringing into the family constellation a brother of the ADC mother who was employed, living in the family picture, and his income was available to the total situation.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, do you have any further comment?

Mr. GALVIN. Or any other relative.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, was the action taken in conflict with the Federal statutes?

Mr. MEYERS. No; if a person actually is a member of the family unit, and makes his income available to the family, then it is perfectly appropriate, and it should be taken into account.

Senator BYRD. 107 cases were closed because of the absent parent's return.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. In a situation where the parent is actually in the home, under the District policy which is acceptable, there would be no eligibility because there is no absence.

Senator BYRD. Do you mean that when you say he is actually in the home?

It says "absent parent's return."

Does he have to be in the home?

Mr. MEYERS. Well, maybe you might have one of the District of Columbia witnesses explain what is meant.

I assumed when it said he returned, that it meant that he had returned and was in the home.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. That is what this particular category means. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. All right. Then you find no fault with that?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

REMARriage OF PARENT

Senator BYRD. Thirty-five cases were closed because of remarriage of the parent.

Mr. Meyers, is there any objection to this reason for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. I think this one we went over before, and again if I remember correctly, the answer was that this is remarriage, and so that you have, in the home, an employable person who is the head of the family, and under District rules this is a ground for ineligibility, and that creates no problem under the Federal rule.

Senator BYRD. Does this reason—

Mr. MEYERS. We would have no question about the closure of the case which is based on resources in the family which were actually available as apparently is the case here.

Senator BYRD. You have no objection to the closing of these cases on this basis?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Seven cases were closed because of the receipt of support or the increase in support from another person outside the home.

Mr. MEYERS. Receipt of support and income, from whatever source, should be taken into account, and this would not create a problem.

CASES RECEIVING BENEFITS UNDER OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE PROGRAM

Senator BYRD. Sixty-seven cases were closed because of the receipt or increase in benefits or pension under the old-age and survivors insurance program.

Mr. MEYERS. Yes, sir. Old-age and survivors insurance benefits which are made available to people, who otherwise need public assistance to supplement that income, are supposed to be taken into account.

Senator BYRD. Eighteen cases were closed because of the receipt or the increase in benefits or pension under other Federal programs.

Mr. MEYERS. I think the answer would be the same. I might check just a minute with Mr. Yourman.

Do you know whether there any special exemptions that might apply to any Federal benefits? I know of none.

Senator BYRD. Yes; Mr. Yourman?

Mr. YOURMAN. I know of none.

Senator BYRD. What is the answer?

Mr. YOURMAN. I know of no exemptions.

Senator BYRD. Now, four cases were closed because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pension under State or local programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Five cases were closed because of the receipt of or increase in the benefits or pensions under a nongovernmental program.

Mr. MEYERS. I think the answer would be the same there, sir, that the source of the income is not material.

Senator BYRD. Fourteen cases were closed because of other material change in income or resources.

Mr. MEYERS. I really do not know what that one means or what is encompassed in it.

Senator BYRD. I suppose you mean other material changes?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Mr. MEYERS. But if we assume that it is simply the existence of income which changed the picture to change the needs pattern, why, this again would raise no question.

Senator BYRD. In 10 cases, there was no material change in the income or resources, but there was a decreased need for medical care, in which no cases were closed and in which there was a decreased need for other requirements.

What does this mean, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. If the child left the home, would be one example.

A person—a child, for example—could have been committed to an institution either as a delinquent or a retarded child.

It may be in one case for as much as a year or 18 months and, in another case, for an extended period.

I believe this is a good example.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, can you think of other examples?

Mr. GALVIN. The child could have reached 18 or be over 16 and not attending school, or the child could have died.

The family could have moved to another home with cheaper rent and, therefore, the total resources available could have been more than the basic requirements would be, and they would have been no longer eligible.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you find any objections here?

Mr. MEYERS. No; under none of these illustrations do I find any objection to this basis for closing.

Senator BYRD. Thirty-six cases were removed because of the refusal, after acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements.

Mr. Meyers, would there be any objection on this point?

Mr. MEYERS. I think—

Senator BYRD. Would you like some further clarification?

Mr. MEYERS. Yes; some.

If we assume that this is similar to one that was discussed in the former year, where I think I made the statement that, without talking to what the particular eligibility requirements were, certainly a recipient is required to comply with policies and regulations of the District Department, and if they fail to do so, that would be an adequate ground for cutting them off.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, do you have any comment?

Mr. SHEA. I think this is basically the same situation as we described before.

REMOVAL OF BASIS FOR ELIGIBILITY

Senator BYRD. All right. Sixty-five cases were removed because a recipient was no longer incapacitated.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. The same answer. If the basis for the eligibility is removed, it is perfectly appropriate to remove them, and they should be removed from the category.

Senator BYRD. Seventy-three cases were removed because the ADC parent returned.

What do you mean by this, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. The person who had been out of the home returned into the home.

I think this describes or is illustrative again of the man who may have been hospitalized, or in prison, or in another jurisdiction, who returned home or in the same jurisdiction and was encouraged by efforts of the agency to come back into the family constellation.

So, in other words, the man is in the home. He is a resource. He is employable.

And the need of the family no longer exists.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I have no question about closing this type of case.

Senator BYRD. Six cases were closed because the ADC parent remarried.

Mr. Shea, would you give us a comment?

Mr. SHEA. In this type of situation, a person who has remarried is presumed to have remarried a person who is employable or employed, and, therefore, has a resource continuously and, therefore, would not be eligible for ADC.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment?

Mr. MEYERS. If we assume one thing further, that they are remarried and living together in the same home so that there was no absence, I see no question in this type of case.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Galvin, or Mr. Shea, is this a proper assumption?

Mr. SHEA. Yes.

Mr. GALVIN. In this category; yes.

Senator BYRD. Eighty-one cases were closed because there was no eligible child in the home.

Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment?

Mr. MEYERS. No eligible child in the home?

Senator BYRD. Yes.

Mr. MEYERS. No. Then there would not be actually a basis for eligibility and they should be closed.

Senator BYRD. Four cases were closed because of admittance to an institution.

Do you care to comment, Mr. Shea, before Mr. Meyers responds?

Mr. SHEA. This is the type of case in which a person could be admitted, for example, to the District training school or an institution for a retarded individual.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any objection to this?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

LOSS OF RESIDENCE

Senator BYRD. Twenty-seven cases were closed because of the loss of residence.

What is meant here, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. The person moved out of the jurisdiction and had not established—and had established residence elsewhere than the District of Columbia.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, is there any objection to this reason?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Now, under this broad category, of the recipients no longer meeting eligibility requirements other than need, there were 152 cases closed because of "other reasons."

Can you give us any example of what you mean by "other reasons" here, Mr. Shea?

This is under the broad category, as stated here, "no longer meets eligibility requirement other than need." And in that category we talk about those who refused, after

acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements, about those who are no longer incapacitated, about the ADC parent's return, about the ADC parent having remarried, and about the eligible child's no longer being in the home.

Mr. SHEA. The reasons for closing are listed or have been listed here in this—is this the same type of situation we had before in the previous year?

Senator BYRD. There is another "other."

Mr. SHEA. Another "other"?

Senator BYRD. You might like to look at this. It is almost at the bottom.

Mr. SHEA. These reasons that Mr. Lajewski gave me, to answer this question in part, but not in totality, first is a continued absence not established, mother employable, voluntary withdrawal, loss of contact, and cannot be located.

There are still others that still have to be identified and this is what we are trying to do back at the agency now.

So I think we will probably be able to clarify this at the next session because we will have looked into the cases and we can find what the "other" means.

Senator BYRD. All right.

On the basis of the explanation thus far, Mr. Meyers, would you have any objection to the closing of these cases?

Mr. MEYERS. No sir. On the basis of those illustrations I think they all fall within the categories and within the explanation that we previously discussed when we went down the list.

Senator BYRD. Now, Mr. Scholz, did you have something further?

Mr. SCHOLZ. I just remembered that the largest number of cases that were under the "other" ones was where the caretaker relative is no longer available.

In other words, where the mother is the payee and the mother deserts the child or is hospitalized or is declared mentally incompetent and, therefore, we can no longer make a payment to her, and there is no other relative payable.

Senator BYRD. What do you do about the children in those cases?

Mr. SCHOLZ. We would have to put them on GPA until we find a person who is willing to take care of them.

Senator BYRD. What about their—

Mr. SHEA. Or institutionalize the children.

Senator BYRD. What about that, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. That is right.

Mr. SHEA. Or a foster home.

Senator BYRD. It has not been made clear to me, Mr. Meyers.

Has it been made clear to you, the reason injected by Mr. Scholz?

Mr. MEYERS. I think I understand it, sir, because presumably the District operates under the same rules as the Federal category in terms of what we will pay for.

In other words, before financial participation is available, with respect to an aid to dependent children case, you have to find that the child is living with certain enumerated relatives and so if there is no relative with whom that child can be living, the case would not be eligible for payment under the Federal category.

Senator BYRD. So you would find no fault with this reason for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Well, that gets us through this category.

We still have the one category remaining in the fiscal year 1961 denominated "other." And 196 cases were closed for "other reasons" not explained here.

So this will be in need of further explanation, as was the same category in the previous table.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Do you think you might be able to give us these this afternoon, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. We are working on it now, sir.

Senator BYRD. Fine. Now, Mr. Lajewski, do you have a comparable table for 1962?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator BYRD. Let me have that.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Surely.

ADC CASES CLOSED IN 1962

Senator BYRD. In fiscal year 1962, under the ADC category, a total of 2,265 cases were closed.

Forty-one, or many of these, Mr. Meyers, are going to be under the same categories.

I think possibly we can speed it up a little here, but I think we ought to go through them all.

Forty-one were closed because of transfer to other aid.

Is there any objection?

Mr. MEYERS. Same answer.

Senator BYRD. And what is the same answer?

Mr. MEYERS. The same answer is that there is no objection.

Senator BYRD. For the record, I think you will have to say that.

Mr. MEYERS. All right, sir.

Senator BYRD. 174 cases were closed because of a material change in the income or resources.

This is specifically because of employment or increased earnings of the ADC father in the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on closing on this basis.

Senator BYRD. 362 were closed for the same reason, but, in this instance, the ADC mother is involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question for closing on that basis.

Senator BYRD. Five cases were closed for the same reason but the ADC child was involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on that type of closing.

Senator BYRD. Six cases were closed because of the same reason, another person being involved.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. 168 cases were closed because of the absent parent's return.

Mr. MEYERS. No question on that on the same basis of the previous answer, that we assume the person is in the home, living in the home, and, therefore, the absence is not established.

Senator BYRD. And he is employable or employed?

Mr. MEYERS. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Forty-four cases were closed because of the remarriage of the parent.

Mr. MEYERS. On the same basis, no question about that one.

We assume again that the two are living together in a home and so there is no absent parent.

Senator BYRD. Forty-seven cases were closed because of the receipt of or the increase in support from the absent ADC father.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Ten, because of the receipt of or increase in support from another person outside the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. 111 cases were closed because of receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under the OASDI program.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-three because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under other Federal programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Four cases because of the receipt of or increase in benefits or pensions under State or local programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Seven, for the same under governmental programs.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-seven were closed because of other material changes, income or resources.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

We assume here that their income or resources have been discovered and as ascertained, that you could not establish the continuing need of the family. No question.

Senator BYRD. One case was closed because of the decreased need for medical care.

CASE CLOSED BY DECREASED NEED IN MEDICAL CARE

What is meant here by this, Mr. Shea, "decreased need for medical care?"

Mr. SHEA. May I ask Mr. Scholz that, please?

Senator BYRD. Yes. Mr. Scholz?

Mr. SCHOLZ. The only assumption I could make, sir, is that there might have been some item going into the home for a specific medical need which was terminated and, therefore, that specific incidental item is referred to in the budget as being no longer necessary, maybe.

In other words, the illness or whatever the disease was, was terminated and the person no longer needed this special device or this special medicine or whatever it might have been.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski, do you have anything on this point?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I would not be able to elaborate on what Mr. Shea said.

Senator BYRD. Would you be able to comment on this, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I think so.

If we assume that the case was eligible, that the medical need was brought about or what was brought about the eligibility and that medical need was removed or reduced so that the need would not be there, I see no question about this type of a case at all, sir.

DECREASED NEED FOR "OTHER REQUIREMENTS"

Senator BYRD. And four cases were removed because of a decreased need for other requirements, "other requirements" being what, Mr. Galvin?

Mr. GALVIN. It could be housekeeper services that the mother was temporarily ill and needed homemaker services.

This could be that.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Shea, anything further?

Mr. SHEA. That is it.

Senator BYRD. The reason again is that there was a decreased need for "other requirements."

Four cases were closed here.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. I see no question about this type of case closing, sir.

Senator BYRD. Sixteen were closed because of other reasons under this category, the category being "No material change in income or resources."

Mr. SHEA. Mr. Lajewski, on that second page, sir, may have answered that question under ADC only.

Again, it is the same reason I gave you before, continued absence not established.

Maybe I had better ask Mr. Lajewski if he has anything further on that.

Senator BYRD. All right. It is on page 1.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Yes, I have page 1.

This I could not answer, sir. We would have to clarify this particular category also.

CASES CLOSED FOR OTHER REASONS

Senator BYRD. Sixteen other cases were closed for other reasons.

A moment ago, I think when we were discussing the fiscal year 1961, you were able to explain this category because Mr. Meyers indicated no disapproval of the closing of five cases under "Other."

Mr. Meyers, can you answer this?

Mr. MEYERS. I believe that—at least, as far as I can tell, sir, we still are in the position of having "Other" not really clarified sufficiently to base an answer on it.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, may I add to this?

These are individuals who have been found to be no longer in need so that they would

be ineligible because they are no longer in need.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. The absence of need is always an appropriate basis for closing a case, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Eighty-two were closed because of the recipients' refusal, after acceptance, to comply with eligibility requirements.

Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. No question about a condition which requires a recipient to comply with eligible conditions specified under the State plan.

Senator BYRD. 105 were closed because the recipient was no longer incapacitated. I assume this is the parent, of course.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. No longer incapacitated.

Mr. MEYERS. There are no questions about closings on this basis.

Senator BYRD. Ninety-nine were closed because the ADC parent returned.

Mr. MEYERS. Again, if these are cases where we find the parent in the home, actually in the home so that there is no absence, no question is raised by this type of closing.

Senator BYRD. Nine cases were closed because the ADC parent remarried.

Mr. MEYERS. Again, I think we should qualify this, as we have the other cases, that we assume that both parents are living in the home so that absence is not established.

In such a case there would be no question.

Senator BYRD. Is this a correct assumption?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Employability or unemployability is the factor in the District of Columbia, but again this is the reason for closing.

Senator BYRD. Ninety-seven were closed because there were no eligible children in the home.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENT

Senator BYRD. One was closed because of loss of residence.

Again, Mr. Shea, what is the explanation?

Mr. SHEA. No longer meeting the residence requirements of the District of Columbia and moved out of the District into this jurisdiction, moved to another jurisdiction.

Senator BYRD. And having established residence there.

Is that correct?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any comment on this point?

Mr. MEYERS. This presents no question, sir.

Senator BYRD. Twenty-nine were closed because of—no, actually, 1 was closed because of admittance to an institution and 29 were closed because of a loss of residence.

We have already covered "loss of residence."

One was closed because of admittance to an institution.

Mr. MEYERS. No question.

ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS OTHER THAN NEED

Senator BYRD. Three were closed because of a change in State law or agency policy, relating to eligibility requirements other than need.

What is meant here, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. I think this could refer or does refer to the change in policy under the unemployment compensation law, which would enable the person to realize from that source adequate income to render them ineligible for public assistance.

Mr. MEYERS. If these closings were on the basis of the existence of income, which re-

duced the need or eliminated the need, there would be no question.

Senator BYRD. Is that it?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Does the closing in each instance here meet that qualification, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes.

CASES CLOSED IN "OTHER REASONS"

Senator BYRD. And 489 were closed because of "Other reasons" in this category, the category being that eligibility requirements, other than need, were no longer met.

Mr. SHEA. The reasons given here, as were given before, were the continued absence not established, the mother employable, voluntary withdrawal, loss of contact, or cannot be located.

This accounts for the vast majority of that number of 489.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, can you comment on this?

Mr. MEYERS. All of these reasons, when established, form an appropriate basis for closing a case.

Senator BYRD. However, there were 33 in this category which were closed for other reasons, Mr. Shea.

Now, we want to clarify this.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. And 301 cases overall were closed for other reasons.

What are the "other reasons"?

Mr. GALVIN. Sir, if I may interrupt, the 301 and the 489 are both included in the ones outlined by Mr. Shea.

They are both marked with an asterisk and and these, for ADC only, come to a total of 790.

These have been explained and also agreed to by Mr. Meyers, and the only thing that is left over is that in the 790 there are 33 that are still to be explained.

Senator BYRD. I see. Then, for the record, of the 790 cases closed for "other reasons" these reasons are as set forth at the bottom of page 2, namely, they are continued absence not established, mother was employable, there was a voluntary withdrawal, there was loss of contact, and there was an inability to locate.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That explains all—

Mr. SHEA. But the 33.

Senator BYRD (continuing). But the 33? And we will have to have an explanation of those 33.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. As far as the 757 are concerned, I suppose, Mr. Meyers, you would have no objection?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir. As I stated before, I think that when you establish these facts on these bases no question is presented.

Senator BYRD. All right. With the exception of this category or of the category that has been denominated "Other" we have covered all categories for closing of an aid-to-dependent-children case in fiscal year 1960, fiscal year 1961, and fiscal year 1962—the past 3 years.

POSSIBLE VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL STATUTE

Thus far, Mr. Meyers, have we found any instance in which the District of Columbia has acted in violation of a Federal statute in removing cases from the aid-to-dependent-children category?

Mr. MEYERS. I do not think I am able to state that quite categorically, Mr. Chairman.

If I may, I think I should make a little explanation or preliminary statement.

I personally, of course, am not in a position to know what the facts are in a particular case and whether the evidence is there to support the finding or anything of the sort.

Nor am I in a position to make an adjudication in a particular case as to whether it is or it is not eligible.

I can speak as an official of the Department who is familiar with our rules as to what type of situation as a basis for a closing would be appropriate or not. And on the basis of the explanations, as we have gone down these lists, and as qualified and based on the understandings that we have, I would say that nothing that we have talked about this morning, in terms of a requirement or a basis for closing, would raise a question under the Federal act.

Senator BYRD. You would have to make the same statement with the same reservations even though we were talking about any State, would you not?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

Senator BYRD. Unless you were personally in on the case, in other words, and knew all the facts, you naturally could not make a categorical reply to that question?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct.

Senator BYRD. But on the basis of the reasons enumerated, whether it be the District of Columbia or any other State, the regulations of that State being what the regulations are in the District of Columbia, you find no instance, as explained here, in which the District of Columbia has acted in contravention of Federal statute?

Mr. MEYERS. None of the reasons that we have discussed this morning would be in conflict with any Federal requirement.

Senator BYRD. Speaking of the Federal statute as amended.

Mr. MEYERS. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. Shea, in the afternoon then, let's try to have an explanation of these "other" cases.

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

NEED FOR CLARIFYING REGULATIONS

Senator BYRD. And I suppose the only question that need be asked at this point would be this: Do you feel, Mr. Shea—and I asked the question earlier—do you feel that the regulations are entirely clear so as to assure the Department, in the application of the regulations, that they are not in conflict with the governing Federal statute, as amended?

Mr. SHEA. The regulations today, sir, I do not believe are in conflict with the Federal statute but, as I indicated before, I feel that all of the regulations, as exemplified in our Public Assistance Manual need to be clarified to some extent.

To a greater extent, I cannot say, but this is my opinion.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you feel that the District of Columbia regulations, governing the eligibility of recipients and governing the removal of recipients from public assistance, need further clarification?

CLARIFICATION NEEDED

Mr. MEYERS. On the basis of my quick look at those regulations and those handbook provisions, Mr. Chairman, I would say that they do need clarification so that we can be certain that they state, as the witnesses have testified, what their intention is, because some of them are sufficiently ambiguous as to lead you to another conclusion.

Now, I would say that just from my quick look that they do need clarification.

Senator BYRD. You are saying that, if the regulations are eminently clear, so as to provide assurance that removals from public assistance will fall into the categories that have been explained, the District will not be acting in contravention of the Federal statute, as amended?

Mr. MEYERS. I would say that if they were clarified, so that we both were satisfied, that none of the bases for eligibility or removal would be the conditions of the home, and the fact of the conduct of the parents, and in applications it was carried out this way, there would be no problem.

Senator BYRD. You saw no instance thus far, in our recapitulation of the reasons for

closing, in which the conduct of the parents or the unsuitability of the home were the reasons for closing?

Mr. MEYERS. None of the reasons that we have gone over this morning, as explained and clarified, in my opinion, fell within that category.

Senator BYRD. All right.

"OTHER" CATEGORY

Mr. Shea, this afternoon let's have an explanation of the category "other" and following that, I would suggest that your Department, working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, go over the regulations which are ambiguous, the regulations in question at this point, and that you effect a clarification of those regulations so as to assure Congress, and so as to assure the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that you will not be acting in conflict with the governing Federal statute.

Understand that the subcommittee is appropriating, or preparing to appropriate, the money on the basis of the regulations, as they are understood to be and as they have been explained.

We are not expecting to appropriate money on the basis of changed regulations unless the current regulations are found to be in violation of the Federal statute.

If the regulations are in violation of the Federal statute, and if you have been enforcing them in violation of the Federal statute, thus we have had no indication that you have been enforcing them in violation of the Federal statute—but if, in your categorization of cases in these groups, we find that you have violated the Federal statute this would naturally mean that there would have to be some revision in your estimates of needs for the forthcoming year.

Consequently, that regulation would have to be changed because it is obvious that we cannot fly in the face of the Federal statutes.

But if we find no conflict with the governing Federal statute, as amended, we are going to make our appropriations on the basis of the budget estimate that you presented here.

CLARIFICATION OF REGULATIONS EXPECTED

In summation, I am saying this, that we expect the regulations to be clarified. If they are not in violation of the Federal statute at this point we are not expecting you to change the regulations so as to liberalize or so as to make more conservative the program.

We are only expecting that the regulations be rewritten so as to make them eminently clear to those people who have to enforce them.

Now, do we have any misunderstanding at this point?

Mr. SHEA. No, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, have I, in your judgment and to your satisfaction, appropriately stated the situation where we find ourselves at this moment?

Mr. MEYERS. I think so, sir.

We, in the Department, look forward to working with the District people in trying to help them in a revision of the controlling policies which will satisfy both of us that we are meeting our legal responsibilities.

Senator BYRD. Yes. It is not the desire or objective of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to dictate to the District of Columbia or to any other jurisdiction in this country as to whether or not its program should be liberalized or made more conservative—

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

Senator BYRD. (continuing). As long as the regulations, governing the eligibility of the recipients, are not in conflict with the governing Federal statute as amended?

Mr. MEYERS. That is correct, sir.

ANTICIPATED CLARIFICATION DATE

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, there is a further question:

What would be a reasonable time in which we could expect to have this clarification effectuated, keeping in mind that it is not my intention to mark up this bill until the regulations are clarified?

Mr. MEYERS. Is this question addressed to me, Senator?

[Afternoon session, 2:30 p.m., Friday, September 7, 1962]

"OTHER" CATEGORY

Senator BYRD. The subcommittee will resume its hearing.

Mr. Shea, do you have now the information that we were wanting earlier, with reference to the category enumerated as "Other"?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir. Since the recess of the session, Mr. Lajewski has additional information.

Senator BYRD. All right, Mr. Lajewski.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, in 19 of these 33 instances the case was closed because the children were committed to the Department of Public Welfare for care. A referral had been made to child welfare, and it was found that conditions were such that a commitment by the juvenile court was requested, and the children were committed to the Department of Welfare. These were the cases which were originally ineligible.

Senator BYRD. Pardon me, now. Let's talk about those you have just named.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. All right.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, would there be any objection that could be made to the closing of these cases?

Mr. MEYERS. No, sir.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In seven instances it was found that the families were originally ineligible, and continue to be ineligible for ADC.

Senator BYRD. So they never were eligible, at any time?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. That is right, sir.

Senator BYRD. There obviously would be no objection here.

Mr. MEYERS. No. I don't know what the grounds for the ineligibility would be, but assuming the appropriate grounds, no question would be raised about that either, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. All right.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In two cases the mother died. We don't know just what happened to the children in this particular instance, with the mother deceased.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, do you have any response to that?

Mr. MEYERS. We assume that in that case there was no remaining relative with whom the child could live and qualify. This would raise no question under the Federal requirements.

Senator BYRD. Is that in accord with your position, Mr. Shea?

Mr. SHEA. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski.

ADMINISTRATIVE CLOSING

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In two instances, the closing of the case was related to an administrative procedure. That is, there were four cases which could have been consolidated into two. So this was sort of an administrative closing. This was to make more efficient the administration of the public assistance program.

Senator BYRD. Is this clear to you, Mr. Meyers?

Mr. MEYERS. Not too clear.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. Well, take, for instance, we find a situation in which a mother receives a grant for her children, and a grandmother in the same home also receives assistance for minor children of her own. Thus, instead of having this as two ADC cases, we combine these into one case.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. I understand. In other words, you consider this as a single group, and meet the needs of the whole group as one case.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. That is right.

Mr. MEYERS. There seems to be no difficulty with that one, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BYRD. Thank you.

Mr. Lajewski?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In one case, there was the incarceration of the mother, and the children were committed to the Department of Welfare. Now, this case could have been included in that first group, but I learned the specifics of this particular case. The mother was incarcerated. Her sentence was for 2 years. And, in this instance, the children had been referred to the Child Welfare Division for care.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. Perfectly appropriate.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In another instance, the case was closed because of temporary hospitalization of the mother at District of Columbia General Hospital for mental observation.

The case was closed.

In this particular instance, the two children were taken by a grandmother, another child was taken by a father.

The father subsequently died, and the grandmother took responsibility for all three children, and this grandmother has an active application for ADC at the present time.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. It seems to be all right under those circumstances.

Mr. LAJEWSKI. In the last instance, the case was found ineligible because the recipient had not declared resources which were available to her.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers.

Mr. MEYERS. On the question of resources which are available and which have not been disclosed, we have no question that that is grounds for ineligibility.

CASES NOT IN VIOLATION OF FEDERAL REQUIREMENT

Senator BYRD. Mr. Lajewski, do you think this fairly well covers all reasons for which the cases were closed under this grouping?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. I do, sir.

Senator BYRD. Do you think there might still be two or three, or a half dozen which you have not elaborated upon at this time?

Mr. LAJEWSKI. There might be one, two, or three, sir. I could not say at this time. But they would not be significant.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Meyers, this narrows it down to a remainder of cases amounting to almost nil. I believe that your statement of this morning is probably still a valid one, with reference to these additional reasons that have been expressed here today. However, I would like for you to have the opportunity to comment as to whether or not this is true.

Mr. MEYERS. It would be my view that closing of cases for any of the reasons just discussed, in the "other" group would not in any way violate any Federal requirement.

Going one step further, as to the remaining, I don't know how many there are, but as you say, a handful—certainly even if we would assume, for discussion purposes, that those other cases, three or four out of these thousands, were cases that may have been improperly closed, this, in and of itself, would not be a sufficient ground for withholding Federal funds, because it would not have been significant enough or substantial enough to have raised a problem of conformity with Federal requirements.

Senator BYRD. I suppose that in any State—there might be a case occasionally which might fall into such a category.

Mr. MEYERS. That is right.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to in-

clude at this point in the RECORD a copy of a report by Raymond F. Clapp, showing the population change anticipated in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington during the decade 1960-70.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POPULATION CHANGE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND IN METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, 1960-70

(By Raymond F. Clapp)

[For simplification of presentation, population numbers have been rounded, usually to the nearest thousands, and percentages usually to the nearest unit. Consequently, the tables, both internally and between tables, contain slight inconsistencies]

Publication of 1960 census data combined with appropriate counts of births and deaths

have made it possible to project to 1970 the population of the District of Columbia and the Washington metropolitan area separately by sex, color, and broad age groups. This has been done by calculating the components of population change in the District of Columbia and Metropolitan Washington for the intercensal decade 1950-60, and comparing these with like calculations for the decades 1940-50 and 1930-40, to indicate trends in births, deaths, and migration. These trends have then been projected to 1970.

Metropolitan Washington in this report consists of the U.S. census standard metropolitan statistical area, or SMSA. It includes the District of Columbia; Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties in Maryland; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, and Alexandria and Falls Church cities in Virginia. The projections indicate the following changes in population composition. The net growth of the SMSA was 498,000 in the 1940's and 529,000 in the 1950's (table 1). This growth is projected at 575,000 for the 1960's.

TABLE 1.—Total population¹

	1940		1950		1960		1970 ²	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Standard metropolitan statistical area.....	975,000	100.0	1,473,000	100.0	2,002,000	100.0	2,577,000	100.0
District of Columbia.....	688,000	68.5	808,000	54.6	764,000	38.2	818,000	31.7
Suburbs.....	307,000	31.5	665,000	45.4	1,238,000	61.8	1,759,000	68.3

¹ All census data for 1930, 1940, and 1950 have been corrected for underenumeration of children under age 5. Therefore they are slightly higher than the officially published census figures.

² Projection 1, discussed later.

The District lost 44,000 population in the 1950's. It is projected to gain about 54,000, or about 7 percent, in the 1960's. This increase must be accommodated by one or more of the following conditions:

1. New residential construction in excess of that lost by conversion to nonresidential use, such as highways and commercial.

2. Construction of increased residential capacity, such as replacing row houses with apartment houses, and conversion of empty or nonresidential land to residential land.

3. Increased occupancy of existing units.

The suburbs are expected to increase over 40 percent in the coming decade. Table 1 shows that by 1970 the population balance between District and suburbs is expected to be reversed from 1940—from 68 percent of the standard metropolitan statistical area in

the District of Columbia in 1940, to 68 percent in the suburbs in 1970.

COMPONENTS OF POPULATION CHANGE

The components of population change are shown in table 2.

In the 1950's there was a dramatic decline of migration as a source of growth, in contrast to natural increase, and this is expected to continue in the 1960's. Natural increase represented 37 percent of the standard metropolitan statistical area population growth in 1940's, and 61 percent in the 1950's. It is projected to 74 percent in the 1960's. To an increasing extent, the youth coming into our labor force, and creating new families, will have grown up in the Washington area, with the advantages and disadvantages that they find here.

TABLE 2.—Components of population change

	Total net growth	Net migration (immigration minus outmigration)	Natural increase (births minus deaths)	
			Number	Percent of total net growth
Standard metropolitan statistical area:				
1940-50.....	499,000	316,000	183,000	37
1950-60.....	529,000	205,000	324,000	61
1960-70.....	575,000	147,000	428,000	74
District of Columbia:				
1940-50.....	141,000	51,000	90,000	64
1950-60.....	-44,000	-157,000	113,000	(2)
1960-70 ¹	54,000	-79,000	133,000	(2)
Suburbs:				
1940-50.....	358,000	265,000	93,000	26
1950-60.....	573,000	362,000	211,000	37
1960-70 ¹	521,000	227,000	294,000	56

¹ Based on projection 1, discussed later.

² Not calculated because total net growth is an algebraic sum of the loss due to net outmigration and a gain due to natural increase.

COLOR

The distribution of the population by color is summarized in tables 3A and 3B. Additional detail is shown in tables 4A and 4B. As far back as 1920, nonwhites constituted about one-fourth of the total population of the standard metropolitan statistical area, and this proportion has remained virtually unchanged since then. The figure projected for 1970 is about 27 percent.

There has, however, been a great increase in proportion of nonwhites in the District of Columbia, and a substantial decrease in the suburbs. Table 3A shows two projections to 1970, based on alternative assumptions about migration within the standard metropolitan statistical area. These assumptions are discussed below. The first projection, 64 percent nonwhite in the District of Columbia and 10 percent in the suburbs, is based on a decreased rate of white migration and an increased volume of nonwhite migration from the District of Columbia to the suburbs than has occurred in the past decade. The second projection, 72 percent nonwhite in the District of Columbia and 6 percent in the suburbs is based on the continuation of current trends.

TABLE 3A.—Proportional distribution of whites and nonwhites in the standard metropolitan statistical area, District of Columbia, and suburbs, 1940-60, with 2 projections to 1970

	[In percent]		
	Total	White	Non-white
Standard metropolitan statistical area:			
1940.....	100	75.9	24.1
1950.....	100	76.5	23.5
1960.....	100	75.7	24.3
1970: 1.....	100	72.8	27.2
2.....	100	72.8	27.2
District of Columbia:			
1940.....	100	71.2	28.8
1950.....	100	64.4	35.6
1960.....	100	45.2	54.8
1970: 1.....	100	36.4	63.6
2.....	100	28.3	71.7
Suburbs:			
1940.....	100	82.0	18.0
1950.....	100	91.4	8.6
1960.....	100	93.5	6.5
1970: 1.....	100	89.8	10.2
2.....	100	93.9	6.1

¹ Bases of projections 1 and 2 are explained in test section on migration and projections.

TABLE 3B.—Population in 1950 and 1960 as a percentage of the preceding decade, by color and area, with 2 projections to 1970

	1950		Project 1	1970 Project 2
	1940	1950		
Standard metropolitan statistical area:				
Total.....	151	136	129	129
White.....	152	133	125	125
Nonwhite.....	147	145	140	140
District of Columbia:				
Total.....	121	95	107	109
White.....	109	66	96	68
Nonwhite.....	150	145	124	142
Suburbs:				
Total.....	217	186	142	141
White.....	230	200	136	142
Nonwhite.....	135	138	222	131

The data may be seen in a slightly different way in table 3B. During the 1950's, in the District the white population decreased about 34 percent, while the nonwhite increased about 45 percent. In the

suburbs whites increased nearly threefold, while nonwhites increased about 38 percent. The last two columns show the currently expected changes during the 1960's based on the two projections. A comparison of tables 3A and 3B indicates that the decreased proportion of nonwhites in the suburbs is due primarily to the large immigration of whites, for the actual number of nonwhites in the suburbs is also increasing.

AGE

From table 3B we see that the District's total population is expected to increase between 7 and 9 percent. However, from table 4A we may calculate that its aged, those 65 years and over, and its youngsters, those under 15 years, will increase about 12 percent while those in the productive groups, 30 to

64 years, are expected to decrease between 7 and 11 percent. As a result, the proportion of the young and the old in the population may go up from about 34 percent in 1960 to about 40 percent in 1970, while those in the most productive years may decline from about 44 percent of the total population in 1960 to about 37 percent in 1970.

The implications are clear. The young and the old in general are the most dependent on family and community for essential services. School, recreation, and welfare services are bound to increase. At the same time, these will rest on a proportionally smaller base of productive workers. The quality of community life can only improve if the income and economic status of these adult productive age groups is improved.

Table 3B indicates that the suburban population may be expected to increase greatly, about 40 percent. However, from table 4B we may calculate that the age shifts will be much less dramatic than in the District. The young and old may increase about 40 percent while the most productive range, 30 to 64 years, may increase about 30 percent. Thus, the proportion that each group is of the total population will not be markedly different from what it is today. While the continued population increase will also require continued great expansion of community services, the income and productive base upon which these services must rest can be expected to increase correspondingly without requiring the serious acceleration that seems necessary in the District.

TABLE 4A.—District of Columbia population by color and age groups, 1960 and projected to 1970 on alternative migration assumptions

Age	White						Nonwhite					
	1960 census ¹		1970 ²				1960 census ¹		1970 ²			
			Project 1		Project 2				Project 1		Project 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
	Total	345,000	100	298,000	100	235,000	100	419,000	100	520,000	100	594,000
14 and under	53,000	15	46,000	15	34,000	14	140,000	33	180,000	34	219,000	36
15 to 29	77,000	22	70,000	24	54,000	23	88,000	21	123,000	24	138,000	23
30 to 44	65,000	19	51,000	17	34,000	15	96,000	23	94,000	18	105,000	18
45 to 64	102,000	30	75,000	25	64,000	27	74,000	18	92,000	18	98,000	16
65 and over	49,000	14	56,000	19	49,000	21	20,000	5	31,000	6	34,000	7

¹ As enumerated, unadjusted for completeness.² Projections 1 and 2 explained in section on migration and projections.

TABLE 4B.—Washington suburban population by color and age groups, 1960 and projected to 1970 on alternative migration assumptions

Age	White						Nonwhite					
	1960 census ¹		1970 ²				1960 census ¹		1970 ²			
			Project 1		Project 2				Project 1		Project 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total.....	1,157,000	100	1,579,000	100	1,642,000	100	81,000	100	180,000	100	106,000	100
14 and under.....	396,000	34	517,000	33	530,000	32	30,000	37	77,000	43	38,000	36
15 to 29.....	230,000	20	375,000	24	389,000	24	18,000	22	40,000	22	27,000	25
30 to 44.....	286,000	25	283,000	18	300,000	18	17,000	21	30,000	17	19,000	18
45 to 64.....	193,000	17	319,000	20	330,000	20	13,000	16	25,000	14	17,000	16
65 and over.....	52,000	4	85,000	5	93,000	6	3,000	4	8,000	4	5,000	5

¹ As enumerated, unadjusted for completeness.² Projections 1 and 2 explained in section on migration and projections.

MIGRATION AND THE TWO PROJECTIONS

Migration data are summarized in tables 2 and 5. Net migration figures by age, sex, and color for each decade since 1930 for the District of Columbia and since 1930 for the metropolitan area have been calculated and studied. There has been a consistent concentration of net immigrants into the metropolitan area by the young adult ages, particularly in those aged 10-20 at the first of the decade, and 20-30 at its close. For the total population there has been a net migration into the metropolitan area. In the 1940's the net immigration was about three-fourths white, declining to about 71 percent in the 1950's. It is projected at about 61 percent in the 1960's. The total net immigra-

tion declined from an estimated 316,000 in the 1940's to about 205,000 in the 1950's. The decline has occurred among both whites and nonwhites and among both males and females.

Projections in general depend on assumptions about both natural increase and migration, for whites and nonwhites separately. For the standard metropolitan statistical area as a whole, a single projection has been made—i.e., a single projection of net increase and net migration, for whites and nonwhites separately. This projection is based on the following assumptions (a) a decrease in net migration into the standard metropolitan statistical area; and (b) no change in present fertility rates. These assumptions are considered moderate. Consequently, the

projections presented for the standard metropolitan statistical area as a whole are neither very high nor very low.

Within the standard metropolitan statistical area two projections have been developed for the District of Columbia. Since the suburban projections are merely subtractions of the District of Columbia from the standard metropolitan statistical area, this has produced two projections for the suburbs. These projections relate to the probable trends in migration. It was felt necessary to prepare alternate projections for the District of Columbia because of its special nature as the central city, and its historic role as the main recipient of the nonwhite migration to the standard metropolitan statistical area.

TABLE 5.—Net migration in District of Columbia, suburbs, and standard metropolitan statistical area for the years 1940-70, by color

	1940-50	1950-60	1960-70			1940-50	1950-60	1960-70	
			Projection 1	Projection 2				Projection 1	Projection 2
White:					Nonwhite:				
District of Columbia.....	-12,000	-209,000	-67,000	-121,000	District of Columbia.....	63,000	52,000	-12,000	53,000
Suburbs.....	286,000	355,000	168,000	212,000	Suburbs.....	9,000	7,000	69,000	4,000
Standard metropolitan statistical area.....	244,000	146,000	91,000	91,000	Standard metropolitan statistical area.....	72,000	59,000	57,000	57,000

For whites the two projections assume the same natural increase; similarly for nonwhites. The two projections are based on different assumptions about migration into and out of the District of Columbia, for whites and nonwhites, separately.

Whites: The District of Columbia white net outmigration rose from about 12,000 in the forties to about 209,000 in the fifties.

Assumption A: This high net outmigration will continue in the sixties.

Assumption B: The net outmigration from the District of Columbia will be between the figures for the forties and the fifties.

Nonwhites: There was a moderate net migration into the District of Columbia both in the forties and the fifties, decreasing somewhat in the later decade.

TABLE 6.—Alternate population projections for the District of Columbia

Nonwhites	Whites	
	Assumption A (235,000)	Assumption B (298,000)
Assumption C (594,000)....	928,000	892,000
Assumption D (520,000)....	755,000	815,000

Assumption C: This moderate trend will continue.

Assumption D: A balanced migration for the District of Columbia; i.e., the migration of nonwhites out of the District of Colum-

bia will be approximately, although not exactly, equal to their immigration.

As shown in table 6, these alternative assumptions produce four possible projections of total population for the District of Columbia, ranging from 755,000 to 892,000. In order to accommodate the extreme high projection, an enormous and most unlikely increase in the housing inventory would be necessary. In order to drop to the extreme low projection, a relatively massive and unlikely migration of nonwhites into the suburbs would be necessary coupled with a simultaneous high outmigration of whites. The confluence of these events seems most unlikely. For these reasons the extreme high and low projections are not considered in this report—although, of course, all things are possible. This report accepts the more reasonable projection range of about 818,000–829,000 population, which can be attained by either one of the two possible assumptions, combinations AC or BD.

Projection 1: White moderate net migration out of the District of Columbia, and nonwhite balanced migration for the District of Columbia; i.e., assumption combination BD.

Projection 2: White high net migration out of the District of Columbia, and nonwhite net moderate migration into the District of Columbia; i.e., assumption combination AC.

The outmigration of whites has been very heavy in the past decade. Furthermore, urban renewal will be an accelerating program

in the coming decade. Therefore, it is reasonable to conjecture that the pace of white outmigration may slacken in the sixties. Also, the increasing pressure of the growing middle class nonwhite population to find better homes, together with the increasing concentration of community efforts in the same direction, makes it reasonable to conjecture that there may be a moderate flow of nonwhites into the suburbs in the sixties. These conjectures produce projection 1, in which, as table 3A indicated, nonwhites will make up about 64 percent of the District of Columbia population and about 10 percent of the suburban population in 1970.

Projection 2 is equivalent to a continuation of present trends, as shown in table 3A. This will produce population in the District of Columbia about 72 percent nonwhite, even though, as shown in table 5, the actual net immigration of nonwhites will be fairly small. The heavy preponderance of nonwhites will result from the high net outmigration of whites and the differential birth rates of whites and nonwhites. Fertility rates of nonwhites are somewhat, although not markedly, higher than those of whites. However, the different birth rates of whites and nonwhites in the District of Columbia are due primarily to the increasing number of nonwhite adults in the childbearing ages, and the relative shift of whites to the older nonchildbearing ages and to nonfamily types (single persons, widows, etc.).

Population 1950 projected to 1970, District of Columbia

ALL CLASSES

[Projection 1. Whites median outmigration; nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
All ages.....		763,956	218,400	85,397	-79,365	817,594	818,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970.....	Under 5.....		113,400	3,375	-19,930	90,095	90,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965.....	5 to 9.....		105,000	3,397	-27,960	73,643	74,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	78,095	533	-15,395	62,167	62,000	62,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	63,350	327	-2,000	61,023	61,000	61,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	52,227	391	16,160	67,996	68,000	68,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	49,382	575	15,130	63,937	64,000	64,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	59,769	882	-4,950	53,937	54,000	54,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	55,198	1,226	-8,500	45,472	45,000	45,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	54,253	1,966	-6,850	45,437	45,000	45,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	55,359	2,963	-6,940	45,456	45,000	45,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	51,224	4,029	-4,320	42,875	43,000	43,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	51,512	5,783	-3,750	41,979	42,000	42,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	48,440	7,169	-4,880	36,391	36,000	36,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	41,558	8,571	-1,290	31,697	32,000	32,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	34,446	9,521	-1,660	23,265	23,000	23,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	69,143	34,689	-2,230	32,224	32,000	32,000

WHITE MALE

All ages.....		158,124	32,300	22,205	-34,275	133,944	134,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970.....	Under 5.....		16,000	360	-5,420	10,220	10,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965.....	5 to 9.....		16,300	400	-8,560	7,340	7,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	10,751	45	-4,725	5,975	6,000	6,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	8,129	45	-260	7,824	8,000	8,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	7,920	81	4,480	12,319	13,000	13,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	10,583	130	2,600	13,053	13,000	13,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	15,066	170	-4,030	10,866	11,000	11,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	12,995	177	-5,120	7,698	8,000	8,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	10,978	275	-3,620	7,083	7,000	7,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	10,156	458	-2,340	7,358	7,000	7,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	9,686	724	-1,510	7,452	8,000	8,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	10,784	1,246	-1,470	8,068	8,000	8,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	11,731	1,970	-1,580	8,181	8,000	8,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	10,993	2,622	-1,010	7,361	7,000	7,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	9,942	3,178	-1,030	5,734	6,000	6,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	18,410	10,318	-680	7,412	7,000	7,000

WHITE FEMALE

All ages.....		187,139	31,100	21,899	-32,690	163,650	164,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970.....	Under 5.....		15,400	265	-5,260	9,875	10,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965.....	5 to 9.....		15,700	297	-8,100	7,903	7,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	10,637	45	-4,400	6,192	6,000	6,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	7,913	24	310	8,199	8,000	8,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	8,113	36	4,600	12,677	13,000	13,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	12,433	89	2,540	14,854	15,000	15,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	15,176	105	-4,000	11,071	11,000	11,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	10,308	94	-3,440	6,774	7,000	7,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	10,020	166	-2,500	7,354	7,000	7,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	11,520	282	-2,140	9,098	9,000	9,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	12,558	445	-1,690	10,423	11,000	11,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	14,607	926	-1,770	11,911	12,000	12,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	15,738	1,188	-2,340	12,210	12,000	12,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	14,372	1,626	-1,410	11,336	11,000	11,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	13,418	2,367	-1,520	9,531	10,000	10,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	30,326	13,944	-1,570	14,812	15,000	15,000

Population 1960 projected to 1970, District of Columbia—Continued

NONWHITE MALE

[Projection I. Whites median out-migration; nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages.....	200,047	78,600	22,177	-5,470	251,000	251,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5.....		41,600	1,500	-5,800	34,300	34,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9.....		37,000	1,800	-5,900	29,600	30,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	28,503	253	253	-3,450	24,800	25,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	23,545	165	165	-1,380	22,000	22,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	17,843	173	173	2,730	20,400	20,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	12,280	200	200	4,940	17,000	17,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	13,175	315	315	2,340	15,200	15,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	15,143	533	533	590	15,200	15,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	15,593	853	160	160	14,000	15,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	15,792	1,262	1,262	-530	14,000	14,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	13,474	1,614	1,614	-160	11,700	12,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	12,502	2,002	2,002	200	10,700	11,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	10,194	2,244	2,244	-350	7,600	8,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	7,973	2,473	2,473	600	6,100	6,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	5,217	2,137	2,137	420	3,500	3,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	8,833	4,953	4,953	120	4,000	4,000

NONWHITE FEMALE

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages.....	218,646	76,400	19,116	-6,930	269,000	269,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5.....		40,400	1,250	-3,450	35,700	36,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9.....		36,000	1,200	-5,400	29,400	29,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	28,204	184	184	-2,820	25,200	25,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	23,763	63	63	-670	23,000	23,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	18,351	101	101	4,350	22,600	23,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	14,106	156	156	5,050	19,000	19,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	16,352	292	292	740	16,800	17,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	16,752	422	422	-530	15,800	16,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	17,662	672	672	-890	16,100	16,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	17,891	961	961	-1,930	15,000	15,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	15,506	1,246	1,246	-960	13,300	13,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	13,619	1,609	1,609	-710	11,300	11,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	10,777	1,767	1,767	-610	8,400	8,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	8,220	1,850	1,850	530	6,900	7,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	5,869	1,839	1,839	470	4,500	4,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	11,574	5,474	5,474	-100	6,000	6,000

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a copy of a report, which was referred to in the hearings of last year as the Andrews Report. The report, dated February 1959,

was also mentioned in this year's hearings.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Population, 1960 projected to 1970, District of Columbia—Nonwhite male

[Projection I. Whites median outmigration; nonwhites balanced migration]

Age, 1960	Age, 1970	Population, Apr. 1, 1960	Births, 1960-70	Deaths, 1960-70	Net migration, 1960-70	Population, Apr. 1, 1970	Rounded
	All ages.....	200,047	78,600	22,177	-5,470	251,000	251,000
Born Apr. 1, 1965, to Mar. 31, 1970	Under 5.....		41,600	1,500	-5,800	34,300	34,000
Born Apr. 1, 1960, to Mar. 31, 1965	5 to 9.....		37,000	1,800	-5,900	29,600	30,000
Under 5.....	10 to 14.....	28,503	253	253	-3,450	24,800	25,000
5 to 9.....	15 to 19.....	23,545	165	165	-1,380	22,000	22,000
10 to 14.....	20 to 24.....	17,843	173	173	2,730	20,400	20,000
15 to 19.....	25 to 29.....	12,280	200	200	4,940	17,000	17,000
20 to 24.....	30 to 34.....	13,175	315	315	2,340	15,200	15,000
25 to 29.....	35 to 39.....	15,143	533	533	590	15,200	15,000
30 to 34.....	40 to 44.....	15,593	853	160	160	14,000	15,000
35 to 39.....	45 to 49.....	15,792	1,262	1,262	-530	14,000	14,000
40 to 44.....	50 to 54.....	13,474	1,614	1,614	-160	11,700	12,000
45 to 49.....	55 to 59.....	12,502	2,002	2,002	200	10,700	11,000
50 to 54.....	60 to 64.....	10,194	2,244	2,244	-350	7,600	8,000
55 to 59.....	65 to 69.....	7,973	2,473	2,473	600	6,100	6,000
60 to 64.....	70 to 74.....	5,217	2,137	2,137	420	3,500	3,000
65 and over.....	75 and over.....	8,833	4,953	4,953	120	4,000	4,000

STUDY OF FOLLOWUP BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION SOCIAL SERVICE ON INVESTIGATION SERVICE FINDINGS: GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION, FEBRUARY 1959

OUTLINE

Purpose of the Study.
Plan of the Study.
Background.
Part 1: What Elements Are Responsible for the Frequent Disagreement in Interpretation of Investigation Service Findings Which Results in Investigation Service Submitting What Appears to Them Conclusive Evidence of Ineligibility, and Social Service Deciding That Assistance Should, Nevertheless, Be Continued.

(a) Analysis of the 49 Cases in Which Investigation Service Reported Evidence of Access or Provided Other Information and the Assistance Payment Was Continued.

1. Reason for Referral.
2. Was Referral to I.S. Justified?

3. Was Continued Assistance Justified?
4. Twenty-six Cases Where Investigation Service Reports "Evidence Found" of Access in the Home.

5. Action Taken on Information Provided by Investigation Service.

6. Community Complaints.

7. Basic Element of Disagreement Related to Policy of Continued Absence.

a. Husband Willing to Live With and Support Family.

b. Eligibility Requirement Other Than Need Not Met.

c. Women in Control.

8. Information Supplied by Investigation Service Not Always Helpful.

(b) Comparison of 29 Cases Submitted by Investigation Service With Findings of Study.

1. Review of Eight Cases Submitted in Which Evidence Appears to Indicate Assistance Should Be Discontinued.

2. Review of 21 Cases Investigation Service Believes Should Have Been Re-referred.

(c) Summary of findings.

(d) Attachments:

No. 1: Report on investigation service.

No. 2: Forms No. 122—July, August, September 1958.

No. 3: Request by social worker for information relating to the presence in the home of husband, paramour or other person.

No. 4: Schedule for study of ADC cases in which investigation service believes to have made a positive report on "access" to the home yet assistance was continued.

No. 5: Examples of difficult situations and attitudes with which the investigation service and social service must work.

No. 6: Action taken by social worker on information provided by investigation service.

No. 7: Examples of preference of mothers for assistance rather than support from husband.

STUDY OF FOLLOWUP BY PUBLIC ASSISTANCE
DIVISION SOCIAL SERVICE ON INVESTIGATION
SERVICE FINDINGS

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The Investigation Service questioned the continuation of assistance in cases where the investigation revealed what appeared to be conclusive evidence that eligibility no longer existed because of the presence in the home or access to the home of a husband, paramour or other person, yet the Social Service staff decided that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued. The Investigation Service questioned the failure of the Social Service to act on the information supplied, and the frequent re-referrals of cases on which information had been supplied previously.

The purpose of the study was to make a detailed analysis and evaluation of a group of cases and to find answers to the following questions:

1. What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and Social Service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued.

2. What elements are responsible for frequent re-referrals of cases to Investigation Service on which what appears to be a conclusive finding has been made as a result of the original referral.

3. What elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers or between units.

It is expected that the results of the study will be used as a basis for a review of the policies relating to the use of the Investigation Service, referral procedures, and clarification of division of responsibility for investigations between Investigation Service and Social Service.¹

PLAN OF THE STUDY

The questions raised by Investigation Service and the proposed study were discussed in conference on October 27, 1958, attended by the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, District Supervisors, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and Standards Specialist.

There was discussion as to questions which might be answered by the study, including the following:

1. Why was the case referred to Investigation Service?

2. Was the referral justified?

(a) What attempt did the social worker make to obtain information before referral?

(b) Could action have been taken on the basis of information already available?

3. Should re-referral have been made?

4. What were Investigation Service's findings?

5. What action did social service take on the Investigation Service report, and when?

6. Were the findings as conclusive as Investigation Service believed them to be?

The question as to what elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers, units, and districts was also discussed. It was decided that this question could be answered only by a study of each caseload, and would not be a part of this phase of the study.

The following decisions were made:

1. The study would not be limited to cases on which Investigation Service had raised question, but, to give proper perspective, would include statistics on all cases referred during a specified period.

2. The basis of the study would be form No. 122, "Report of Investigation Service," for the months of July, August, and September 1958. See attachment No. 1.

Form No. 122, "Report of Investigation" serves as the basis for continuing study and evaluation of Investigation Service. Page 1 is completed by Investigation Service and attached to the investigator's written report to the social worker. The form shows the information requested by the social worker and the information furnished by Investigation Service. It also shows other information developed by Investigation Service. For example—Investigation Service is requested to determine if a paramour, John Smith, has access to the home. If John Smith is found in the home, a check is entered under "Evidence found." However, if Robert Brown, father of the client's expected child, is found living in the home, a check would be placed under "No evidence" as to John Smith's access, but the information as to Robert Brown's presence in the home would be entered by Investigation Service under item No. 11-F. Entry would be made in the same manner if the client were found to be employed full time. After the social worker acts on the Investigation Service report, or in any event within 60 days from receipt of the report, he completes page 2 showing action taken and returns the form to Investigation Service. The form is signed by both the worker and the unit supervisor. The forms are submitted quarterly by Investigation Service to Research and Statistics for tabulation.

3. A detailed study of case records would be made in cases where Investigation Service believes a positive report has been made on "access", yet assistance is continued.

4. A schedule would be developed and the cases read against this schedule.

5. Findings of the study, unrelated to Investigation Service, would be submitted to the Agency for consideration and appropriate action.

The cases were read during November and December 1958 and a first draft of the study prepared during January and submitted January 22, 1959.

On February 5, 1959, there was a second meeting with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and Standards Specialist. Comments on the draft submitted by the Superintendent on January 28, 1959, were discussed.

It was decided that the study would consist of three parts related to the purpose of the study.

Part I: What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and Social Service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued?

It was agreed on February 5, 1959, that Investigation Service would submit a list of cases where it was believed conclusive evidence of ineligibility had been submitted.

Part II: What elements are responsible for frequent re-referrals of cases to Investigation Service on which what appears to be a conclusive finding has been made as a result of the original referral?

It was agreed on February 5, 1959, that Investigation Service would submit a list of cases which they believed should not have been re-referred.

Part III: What elements are responsible for the wide variation in the number of referrals between workers or between units?

Part I is to be completed first.

Part II is to be completed when the list of cases submitted by Investigation Service has been studied.

Part III is to be completed at a later date, when plans can be made for a study of aid to dependent children caseloads.

BACKGROUND

The Investigation Service was established in October 1955 as the result of a recommen-

dation by the Interdepartment Committee for the Enforcement of the Nonsupport Laws for the District of Columbia. This Committee recommended the establishment in the Public Assistance Division of a specialized unit of trained investigators for the purpose of determining eligibility of applicants who request assistance because of the absence of a parent. The unit was to concentrate on locating absent parents. Less than a year later, in July 1956, after operating on this limited basis, it was decided that the services of the investigators were also needed urgently in establishing other factors of eligibility. In December 1957, the types of cases to be referred were reconsidered and redefined. Currently, the following situations are to be referred:

Cases to be referred:

1. Clarification of bank accounts, postal savings accounts, and building and loan accounts, stocks or bonds, civil service, railroad and other types of retirement, disability and veterans' benefits, workmen's compensation, inheritances, accident claims, small businesses, vehicles including taxicabs, licenses, ownership, and income.

2. Any case (ADC, GPA, AB, ATD, OAA) in which there is reason to believe that client is not eligible for assistance or that there are factors in the case affecting eligibility which cannot be proved by the social worker.

3. A person who reapplies for public assistance whose case had previously been closed and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources. This type of case should be marked "Rush."

4. Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing, any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location will benefit PAD.

A person is considered "missing" if:

(a) Presumed to be in District of Columbia, exact address or place of employment unknown;

(b) Presumed to be outside of District of Columbia, exact address or place of employment unknown;

(c) Presumed to be deceased, no proof available.

A person is considered "not missing" if:

(a) Social worker knows exact home address or place of employment;

(b) Currently paying under court order or court agreement.

5. Any active ADC case in which the recipient becomes pregnant and the father is allegedly absent from the home.

6. Any case in which it appears that the recipient is living in a manner, or has use of material possessions, which does not appear compatible with the known resources of the family, and which the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove, such as concealed income, employment, illegal activity, etc.

7. Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved—either the husband, father or one or more of the children, or some other male person—is present in the home or has free access to the home, if the social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to the presence or absence.

8. Any complaint or denunciation—anonymous or otherwise—of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient, is to be referred immediately for investigation of the validity of such a complaint. The social worker will not discuss the complaint or denunciation with the recipient prior to the first visit by the investigator. Experience has proved that this procedure is required to protect the best interests of PAD.

9. Any complaint or denunciation concerning other factors of eligibility after the social

¹ Informational Bulletin No. 24-58, dated Oct. 29, 1958.

worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion and feels Investigation Service can provide the proof more expeditiously.

10. All cases except OAA and AB in which the landlord lives in the same premises as recipient, or recipient's home is rented in another person's name, unless the landlord is a relative of the recipient or is a recipient.

11. All cases except OAA and AB in which the recipient shares the rent of a home or an apartment with another family, who are not relatives or recipients, and has lived with the same family at a previous address.

12. Any case in which the recipient has a roomer of the opposite sex.

13. An active or closed case when there is a hearing pending, and the social worker needs additional information for the hearing.

Cases not to be referred:

1. To determine only the home address of persons who are "not missing". These include situations where:

(a) The social worker knows person's exact home address or place of employment.

(b) The person is currently paying under court order or court agreement (father who is and has been supporting regularly through court order, but has otherwise been completely out of touch with the children and their mother).

(c) Paternity proceeding against putative father was dismissed by court, even though client still asserts he is the father.

2. To determine home address of paramours or suspected paramours who are neither fathers of ADC children nor financially responsible for support in other categories.

3. To locate a father previously located when it has been determined that he is a derelict, or permanently incapacitated, has never supported himself, much less anybody else, and that any interest on his part in the children or their mother would be distinctly undesirable.

Action on cases does not originate with the Investigation Service. Investigation is made only on cases referred by the social service staff. The responsibility of the Investigation Service is confined to factfinding and reporting the results of investigations. The social service staff is responsible for deciding which cases are to be referred, requesting specific information, evaluating the findings reported by Investigation Service, determining the effect of the findings on the original or continuing eligibility, and for taking action required by agency policy.

As Investigation Service reviewed the entries made on form No. 122 by the social service staff as to action taken on information supplied, it was found that the action taken did not appear to be consistent with agency policy. It was this concern, expressed by Investigation Service, which led to the study.

Part I: What elements are responsible for the frequent disagreement in interpretation of Investigation Service findings which results in Investigation Service submitting what appears to them conclusive evidence of ineligibility, and social service deciding that assistance should, nevertheless, be continued.

As a means of finding answers to this question, a total of 531 forms No. 122 for the months of July, August, and September 1958, were reviewed. One hundred and seventy-two of these represented requests for the location of a husband, paramour or other person. Twenty-nine were requests for information on resources or other information. Three hundred and thirty requested information as to the presence in the home of a husband, paramour or other person. See attachment No. 2.

A summary statistical report only was made for the cases where information was requested as to "location" or "resources".

A review was made of the 330 cases where Investigation Service was requested to provide information as to the presence in the

home of a husband, paramour or other person. See attachment No. 3.

A summary statistical report only was made for the following cases:

1. Investigation Service reports evidence of "access," and the application was held pending or denied, or the case closed.

2. Investigation Service reports no evidence found.

3. Cases withdrawn by the social worker or withdrawn from the study by I.S.

4. Cases in categories other than ADC.

Of the 330 cases requesting information as to presence in the home, I.S. reported "no evidence found" in 133 of the cases. One hundred and sixteen cases were closed or the application denied prior to the study. Of these, 17 of the applications terminated and 36 of the 65 cases closed, or a total of 53 were in relation to the eligibility factor of absence.

Eighty-one cases were not closed. Of these 81 cases not closed, I.S. reported evidence found in 45. In 27 cases no evidence was found on the specific reasons for referral, but other information was submitted which I.S. believed would have a bearing on the case situation. This information was supplied on form No. 122 by an entry in red under item 11-F: "Incidental Information Developed by I.S." Cases withdrawn by I.S. or by the social worker were eliminated. Cases in categories other than ADC were also eliminated. This brought the total of cases included in the study to 49.

A detailed analysis was made of the 49 cases in which I.S. reported evidence found of access to the home or which no evidence was found on the specific reason for referral but other information was submitted by I.S. and the assistance payment continued. From the point of view of the agency, there was no need to distinguish between these two groups of cases in the study.

A schedule was developed, with the assistance of the statistician, and the 49 cases read against this schedule. See attachment No. 4.

To complete the schedules, it was necessary to read each case carefully and completely. Without this complete reading, the questions on the schedule could not be answered, particularly those as to whether referral I.S. was justified and whether the continuation of assistance was justified.

A. Analysis of the 49 cases in which I.S. reported evidence of access or provided other information and the assistance payment was continued.

1. Reason for referral: The 49 cases showed a variety of reasons for referral. In 13 cases referral was made for the purpose of obtaining new information. Fourteen cases were referred to request I.S. to confirm absence or presence where not clearly shown. Two cases were referred to confirm absence or presence when this was clearly shown in the case record. Two cases were referred to request I.S. to investigate the current situation where the cases had been closed previously because absence was not established. In 15 cases, I.S. was asked to investigate the current situation in cases where previous I.S. report or the case record indicated the man has access to the home. Two cases were referred for a combination of reasons, and one referral was made to locate the man named as the father of a child and to determine whether he, or any man, had access to the home.

2. Was referral to Investigation Service justified?

In 33 of the 49 cases, the study showed that the social worker was justified in referring the case to Investigation Service. In 16 the referral was not justified. In 13 of the 16 cases, there appeared to be adequate information in the case record on which to base a decision as to ineligibility. In one case the man was mentally incapacitated and was, therefore, no resource; in one case a followup on a previous Investigation Serv-

ice report would have shown continued absence; and in one case the reason for referral was not clear.

Case No. 44 is an example of situations where referral to Investigation Service was not justified because there was adequate information in the case record on which action could be taken.

When Miss S applied for assistance in September 1952, she was described as "meek and retiring." She had two children and was pregnant by Mr. H, who had brought her to the District of Columbia, and who was seen in February 1953. He seemed unconcerned and the worker notes that he "apparently only came to see me in order to keep his troubles regarding the situation at a minimum." Miss S said in 1954 she did not know where he was. On July 20, 1955, the worker found a report showing that Miss S had given birth to a child on February 4, 1955. She said at first she had given the child away, then became confused and said she still had the child, whose father was Mr. P. When interviewed on July 26, 1955, Mr. P doubted he was the father, and said Miss S had relations with and received money from other men. On December 27, 1955, Mr. P said Miss S had "ordered him not to come there any more." He thought this was because she was interested in another man whom he thought lived with her. On January 23, 1956, Mr. P told of seeing a man there three or four times, and at 5 a.m. In April "a very fancy two-wheel bicycle, tricycle, and other expensive toys" were noted. Miss S's aunt said Mr. H stops by in the evening to see the children. On September 17, 1958, Miss S said Mr. H usually comes on Sundays. Miss S was described as "very arrogant and refused to give information very readily to worker."

Another example is case No. 24 in which a followup of previous Investigation Service reports would have shown continued absence did not exist.

3. Was continued assistance justified?

Of the 49 cases reviewed, it was found that the continuation of assistance was justified in 21 cases and not justified in 28 cases. In 18 of these 28 cases, the I.S. reported "No evidence found," on the specific reasons for referral, but other information was submitted. These cases included some of the most flagrant examples of situations where it was found the continuation of assistance was not justified.

The finding that the continuation of assistance was or was not justified was based in many instances on information contained in the case record rather than on I.S. findings.

In case No. 1, for example, there had been no real investigation of eligibility. The agency policy regarding the requirement that the fathers of the children be interviewed when possible was ignored. The application for assistance in 1953 was terminated because Mrs. A had not made any effort to get support from the fathers of her children. Yet, when she applied in 1958, EA was authorized and the grant continued without any substantial effort to talk with either the two fathers or with Mrs. A's husband. The following entry is made on Form No. 258—"Deprived of Parental Support—ADC," in regard to an attempt to reach one father by telephone: "I was told that he lives at this address, works at night and sleeps during the day. Hence he did not wish to be disturbed." There is no record of any attempt to disturb him. There is repeated reference to Mrs. A's confusion and to conflicting information given by her. She was referred under one name and the case carried under another. This was never cleared nor her marriage verified. Although "it appears Mrs. A could not even remember half the time what she says," and "gave repeated conflicting information," her statement that the man found in the home by

I.S. is "a mere friend who lives in a different apartment," is accepted without verification.

In case No. 11, I.S. reports "No evidence found," as to the specific request by the social worker, with the following incidental information added: "May be pregnant." In the space under "Action and Results on I.S. Report," the worker entered "No action taken: Form No. 29 was returned indicating no pregnancy." However, the record contains convincing evidence that continued absence was not established from the time of application in 1956. On 5-7-58 the record says: "Worker was admitted and was told by one of the children that his daddy was at home." The worker saw a man in bed, whom Miss D said "was only a fellow she had asked to spend the night with her because she had been annoyed by men looking for the girls who lived in the apartment before her." Miss D refused to let the worker speak with the man or to give his last name. "Worker also wondered if the man in the home was willing to support the family and he answered in a loud voice from the bedroom that he would. Miss D stated that she knows he would not and wondered if worker could overlook what she had seen; that is, the man in the bedroom. Miss D was told that agency would grant one more check in an attempt to help her plan for her family, however, we would have to talk with her and the man in the home before it could be clearly planned." On 5-12-58 Miss D told worker Mr. J had returned to his home in Virginia. The worker recommended that assistance be terminated and the case closed. However, the case was not closed. During June, July, and August Miss D kept calling the agency, and a telephone call was received from Mr. J who would not come to the office. "Mr. J said that he was interested in Miss D's family receiving assistance, but he has nothing to do with her family and what PAD will do for them." Assistance was not granted during June, July, and August according to Payroll Control. On August 8, 1958, Miss D talked with the supervisor and gave Mr. J's address. "She was told that assistance would continue if it can be verified that he lives at this address." I.S. reported on September 9, 1958, that Mr. J's address had been verified. Assistance was authorized and has continued.

In case No. 13, I.S. reports on form No. 122 "No evidence found" and I.S. reports gave no evidence of "access."

The record revealed at least four pregnancies by one man. No record was found of discussion of absence policy. No effort was made to communicate with the father, although both address and name of employer were known.

In most instances the decision that worker was not justified in withholding assistance without further followup could not be made with confidence. The decision was made in recognition of the problems for the agency, particularly in situations where the woman's relationships were casual ones, with many different men most of whom seemed to feel no responsibility for the woman or for their children.

An illustration is case No. 4. Mrs. B was born in 1932. At least 6 different men are the fathers of her 10 children. Five of these children are with Mrs. B., two are with an aunt who is receiving assistance, two are with Mrs. B's mother who received assistance over a long period and one is with another aunt. When Mrs. B's promiscuous behavior was discussed, she was described as "nonchalant and passive." On February 21, 1956, Mrs. B claimed not to know the whereabouts of the fathers of her children, including Mr. L, the father of Marjorie. A review of the case of the aunt with whom Marjorie is living (case No. 15, also included in the study), showed

that Marjorie's father, Mr. L, has had frequent contacts with the agency. He came to the office of his own volition in April 1958. He came because he was aroused about the care Marjorie was receiving in her aunt's home. He said the home was no place for any young child because men were lounging around all the time and several had already made advances to Marjorie. He said Mrs. B had always known where he was. He said that when Mrs. B became pregnant with Marjorie they had planned to marry and he and Mrs. B had arranged for her to do some babysitting. Mr. L said Mrs. B's mother and her aunt "had been strongly against this, saying they did not want Mrs. B to work, they never had, but had been on assistance all their lives and they thought this was the best place for D too." According to the record, not only Mrs. B's mother but her grandmother had received assistance. Mr. L aroused considerable community interest in this situation and a joint agency conference was held on July 25, 1958, including the Public Health Nurse and representatives of the C.W.D., Women's Bureau, and PAD. Referral was made to I.S. on June 20, 1958 to determine whether a family relationship existed between Mrs. B and Mr. L or anyone else and to determine whether Mr. J or any other man has access to the client's home. Mr. J is the father of Mrs. B's youngest child. In July 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. B was dressed up and preparing to go out with Mr. J who was waiting for her. Mr. J accosted the investigators, became noisily belligerent and was arrested for disorderly conduct. The referral to I.S. states, "She does not seem to have any concept of right and wrong and the case record indicates incest in the entire family." This was referred to a higher supervisory level for a decision as to what action the agency should take in dealing with this situation. It is for this reason only that the continuing assistance was justified. It is noted with concern that Mrs. B's case and that of her sister continue to be handled by different workers, the worker handling Mrs. B's case being unaware of the continuing agency contact with the father of one of Mr. B's children living in the home of an aunt. See also case No. 26, cited under section 8.

The decision that the worker was not justified in withholding assistance was also made in recognition of the problems and attitudes with which both the social worker and I.S. must work. The records contain copious evidence of evasion, deception, fabrication, and falsification. For examples of difficult situations and attitudes, see attachment No. 5.

4. Twenty-six cases where I.S. reports "Evidence Found" of access in the home.

It was found that the continuation of assistance was not justified in 12 of these cases. In 14, it was believed that the continuation of assistance was justified. In 12 cases, continued absence was not clearly established, but the worker was not justified in withholding assistance without further followup. In only two cases was it believed that the continued assistance was justified without further followup.

In one of these two cases, No. 38, Mr. N told the worker on August 13, 1958, that "his wife refused to take him back because she could get more from PAD." The entry on form No. 122 shows "Family given 3 months (October, November, and December) for Mr. N to find employment."

In the other case, No. 34, the notation on form No. 122 says, "Assistance continued because Mr. L was committed to the hospital for observation." The record shows that Mr. L was a patient at a New York mental hospital in 1939 and at St. Elizabeths in 1953. No medical or psychiatric reports were found in the record and Mr. L has never been seen.

5. Action taken on information provided by Investigation Service.

The fact that 116 applications were terminated and cases closed prior to the study would indicate that the social worker took prompt action on information supplied by I.S.

In 24 of the 49 cases studied, the record showed that the I.S. report was discussed with the recipient. In 13 cases no action is recorded in the case record. However, in 3 of these 13 cases, the entry on form No. 122 indicates there was discussion, although the discussion was not recorded. In seven cases, no action was required. See attachment No. 6.

A few instances were found where the I.S. report is misquoted.

In case No. 22, an entry is made on June 11, 1958, "Interim report from I.S. that absence has been established." The I.S. report did not say this.

In case No. 44, Mrs. S had been untruthful and unreliable in her relations with the agency since her application in 1952. In May 1958, I.S. was asked to visit the home after 10 p.m. to learn who was frequenting the home. The investigation was inadequate and visits were not made as requested. The entry by the social worker on form No. 122 says: "Report shows no man in the home or frequenting the home. Grant continues." The I.S. report does not show this.

In other instances both agency policy and I.S. reports are ignored.

In case No. 42, referral was made to I.S. to determine the absence of Mr. S from the home and to locate two fathers. No effort was made to locate Mr. S, either by the worker or by request to I.S., although his address and place of past employment are recorded. Investigation Service located both fathers in South Carolina, but the social worker made no attempt to communicate with them. Investigation Service reported that Mrs. S was pregnant and found another man in the home. The following entry is made on form No. 122, "Mrs. S admits being pregnant and it has been confirmed by medical report. Since man in home was determined to be living at another address, which was verified, there is nothing we would question in this case and the grant continues." The review date is July 31, 1959.

The following cases are other examples of situations where questionable use is made of information supplied by I.S.

In case No. 46, when Mrs. W reapplied for assistance in July 1958, she said she had a friend, Mr. C. Referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mrs. W's husband or Mr. C had access to the home. (Mr. W had said, when Mrs. W previously received assistance, that he would like to live with his family.) Mr. C was found in the home on two occasions in August and September. The following entry, dated October 24, 1958, is made on form No. 122. "Assistance is being continued pending an interview with Mrs. W and Mr. C and also verification of Mr. C's actual residence at the Dunbar Hotel."

In case No. 3, I.S. furnished the address of the husband, but no effort was made to communicate with him.

In case No. 24, the recorded entry, dated August 25, 1958, says: "Worker told Mrs. G that if the report indicated that Mr. P was in the home, her assistance would be discontinued as there was no continued absence." Investigation Service report showed that Mr. P was in the home, but the grant was continued.

Case No. 20 was closed in 1952 because Miss H was arrested on a narcotics charge and engaged in an unlawful business. She applied in 1955 after her release from Occoquan. In March and June 1958, referrals were made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B had free access to the home. The record contains a newspaper clipping dated March 22,

1956, where the judge of the juvenile court questions Miss B's eligibility for assistance.

The following reports were received from I.S.:

April 2, 1958—Four men found in home at 10 a.m. Sunday.

April 3, 1958—Two men found in home at 9:05 p.m.

April 4, 1958—Two men and one woman found drinking at 9:45 p.m.

April 4, 1958—An undetermined number of men and women found at 2 p.m.

August 19, 1958—Four men found at 7:45 p.m.—"all showed signs of extreme intoxication."

I.S. noted on form No. 122 "Four men found constantly in home."

The following entry is made in the case record:

"September 10, 1958—a final report was received from I.S. dated 8-19-58 indicates that Mr. B does not have a free access to the home; however, several men were found in the home on several visits except the last. This appears that Miss H is trying to improve her mode of living. * * * The following entry is made on form No. 122—"No action taken because I.S. report did not indicate Miss H has a man living in the home or having free access."

6. Community complaints: In a number of cases complaints were received as to the behavior of recipients. With few exceptions, these complaints were made by responsible members of the community. There were frequent complaints by fathers concerning care given to children by their mothers.

Procedures require the immediate referral to I.S. of complaints and denunciations of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient. Referral is also required of complaints and denunciations concerning other factors of eligibility after the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion, and feels I.S. can provide the proof more expeditiously.

In only one case was it found that immediate referral was made to I.S.

Case No. 22. In September 1958 an informer reported that Mrs. H's behavior was "a disgrace to the neighborhood."

Case No. 23. In April 1958 the landlord criticized the agency for granting assistance. He said Mrs. H knew where her husband was, that men frequented the home, Mrs. H neglected the children, was employed and that she was pregnant by a Mr. W. Immediate referral was made to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. H was having relations with Mr. W or any other man and if she was working. Investigation Service reported no employment or access.

Case No. 39. An anonymous letter was sent to the Director of Public Welfare complaining that Mrs. P drinks, lives with a Mr. H, who spends the PAD grant and beats the children.

Case No. 6. The parole officer reported in 1943 that he did not think conditions in the home were all they should be, and mentioned the number of men in and entering the home. In 1944 a neighbor complained that Mrs. B and her company came into the yard only half clad. There were three reports from neighbors complaining of Mrs. B's conduct and conditions in her home. These reports said she kept a disorderly house, gave improper care to the children, was working, had a telephone, and kept the house filled with men every night. These letters were not of a malicious nature but pleaded with the agency to "see to this woman." The writer of one of the letters suggested contacting property owners in the neighborhood for information but the record does not show that this was done. The most recent complaint was a letter received in August 1958 describing Mrs. B as a "menace," and told of her drinking, having men living with her and of her having "drank so much wine and stuff until she is not herself any

more." The writer of the letter suggested that the taxpayers' money could be put to better use. Referral to I.S. was not made until September 1958.

Case No. 20. Mrs. Hayes of Fides House reported drinking, foul language, and abuse of the children. Referral to CWD was suggested.

Case No. 14. Mrs. E was evicted by NCHA because she had been a problem and a disturbance over a period of years.

Case No. 17. The agency received complaints from responsible individuals concerning "wild parties, cursing and cavorting in public, a man living in the home, etc."

Case No. 49. Mrs. W's mother complained about her "running the streets and making no plans for the children's care." She was evicted from the Dunbar Hotel because of her behavior.

Case No. 18. The landlord reported that Miss G left her children for periods as long as 1 week.

7. Basic element of disagreement to policy of continued absence.

The basic element responsible for disagreement between findings by I.S. and actions by the social worker was found to be in relation to the agency policy of continued absence.

The agency recognizes that the eligibility factor of continued absence is most complex and difficult. A great deal of staff thought and time was invested in the development of the section of the Manual relating to continued absence, which reads in part as follows:

"Continued absence does not exist solely because the parent rents or has living quarters available at another address or is supporting by court order. If the parents are engaging in a marital relationship and the man has free access to the home, then that man is not to be considered as 'absent from the home.'"

"Continued absence is not established when, in the judgment of the agency, a man or woman who have lived together make separate living arrangements for the purpose of establishing eligibility for assistance."

"Only in situations where strong, convincing evidence is submitted that a parent is no longer in the home and has discontinued his relationship, shall the factor of continued absence be established. The burden of proof rests with the applicant and must be substantiated, if possible, by statements of other persons in a position to know the facts and by any other available evidence."

"There must be proof that a parent is absent from the home; there must be evidence that the absence is 'continued' and that the child is deprived of support or care because of this absence. Absence from the home is recognized as being 'continued' when reliable evidence shows that the absence has a degree of permanency in contrast to a temporary absence. There must be a logical and responsible account as to the severing of the relationship, the reason for its being broken, and the time at which the relationship ceased."

"When a parent or other relative applies for ADC, it must be understood that specific circumstances relating to deprivation of parental support must be verified, regardless of where the father is living. The applicant needs to understand and accept the fact that no parent is ever relieved of his legal responsibility in relation to his children, regardless of his feeling toward the children or their mother. It should be explained that both parents have a part in the application, if this is possible, and participate in plans for the children. It should be explained that the absent parent will be interviewed unless it is obviously impossible or inappropriate to do so. The purpose of this interview with the father is to give him an opportunity to tell his side of the story, to express his interest in and plans for his children, to provide

verified information as to his income and to decide what action he wishes to take regarding support."

"If the mother or other relative applying indicates that the absent parent is not interested in taking part in planning for the child, or that it would be inadvisable or impossible for him to do so, the Agency requires the person applying to produce some evidence of this fact."

"The applicant is responsible for supplying information concerning the absent parent, and for making every effort in good faith to locate him and to have him take a responsible part in the application. If the applicant refuses to supply information concerning the absent parent, and to make efforts to locate him, eligibility cannot be established."

"The requirement of seeking support from the absent parent must be met continuously and shall be a part of every reconsideration and review."

"The eligibility factor of continuous absence is established by the mother's statement and corroborating evidence. The most satisfactory corroboration or supporting evidence is to have knowledge of the whereabouts of the father who is absent and to find out by talking with him his version of the nature of the existing relationship between the parents and his ability and willingness to support the child and the mother. Such information should cover the past, present, and future in order to make a proper appraisal of the child's situation in relation to the degree of support and care he can expect from his parents and the extent to which the agency must supplement or substitute for the responsibility of the parents."

"If it is impossible for the mother to have the father come to the office to talk with the social worker, the social worker shall make every reasonable effort to get in touch with him concerning support and care for his family."

"In all active cases in which the basis for assistance is 'continued absence' of the father from the home and the agency has a reasonable basis for believing that a parent is in the home, assistance shall be discontinued."

"If there is reason to believe that unreported contributions are being made to the support of the home, assistance shall be discontinued until information is supplied to or obtained by the agency to enable it to determine the facts in the case."

"All resources available to the mother of the children born of a previous marriage or relationship must be determined or clarified before need can be established."

Agency staff has been and continues to be deeply concerned because public funds are supporting, through the agency, situations where absence does not in fact exist, where the agency is deceived and provides money to supplement the income of fathers who are not absent, but who manage not to be in the home when I.S. or the worker is there."

It was primarily to deal with this most difficult and troublesome factor of eligibility that I.S. was established.

In a few of the cases read, the agency policy is carefully explained and recorded at the point of intake, and the requirement that the father be seen is carried out. In an alarming number, the policy is disregarded completely.

Case No. 18 is perhaps the worst example: When Miss G applied in 1946 she gave the address of Mr. E who was responsible for her pregnancy, but he was not seen until 1958, 12 years later. Assistance has continued, except for a brief period in 1950.

On May 8, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Miss G has roomers and to determine whether any man has access to the home. The referral says that on two oc-

casions the worker observed her giving hand signals to men who were about to enter her home. On May 26, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. E in the home. Miss G said that Mr. E "just happened to be there." On June 5, 1958, Mr. E was seen by the social worker for the first time. This interview is recorded in seven lines and this mostly of a discussion of employment and his address. The entry on form No. 122 under "Action and Results on I.S. Report," "None—we obtained proof that Mr. E was not living in the home."

In case No. 13, Miss E was 20 years of age when she applied for assistance in July 1957. Mr. B was the father of her unborn child and had been responsible for two pregnancies resulting in miscarriages. She said she "broke off with him" the previous month. The intake worker recorded: "She understood that the area worker would want to talk with Mr. B." After termination due to loss of contact, Miss E applied again in July 1958. She had given birth to another child by Mr. B, and gave his address and the name of his employer. His address is also shown on form No. 258. Assistance continues without any request that he come to the office or any attempt to get in touch with him. Referral was made to I.S. in July 1958 to determine if Mr. B "has free access to the home and is maintaining a continuing relationship." On September 29, 1958, I.S. reported no indication of access.

This record contains a seven page report, undated and unsigned, which seems to have been a part of an unmarried mothers study, and which gives intimate information as to Miss E's sexual experiences. She tells of her belief that it is all right to have sexual relations "with fellows outside of marriage if you are going with them," that all her friends do it, and that, in relation to Mr. B, she "just couldn't pull herself away from him."

Case No. 42. There is no record of any effort either by the worker or by referral to I.S. to locate Mr. S, who is said to have deserted, although his address and place of employment are recorded. I.S. located two fathers, but no effort was made by the worker to communicate with them. On August 15, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S said she was pregnant by her husband. Emergency assistance was authorized July 21, 1958, and the review date is set for July 31, 1959. The entry on form No. 122, dated November 4, 1958, reads: "Mrs. S admits being pregnant and it has been confirmed by medical report. Since man in home was determined to be living at another address, which you verified, there is nothing we would question at this time and the grant continues."

A review of what is found in this record gives a sense of knowing almost nothing whatever about Mrs. S.

There was evidence that the Agency is not able to cope with the complex situations and the deep-seated problems in some of the ADC cases, to hold to Agency policies and requirements, or to keep track of and evaluate the information already in records.

There is evidence in the cases read that the problems are too complex and complicated for the staff to grasp or to deal with effectively. The information already available is not always noted or evaluated; threads in the investigation are dropped and never picked up again.

Another important fact stands out in the relationship of the Agency to fathers: After the recipient or the I.S. or the social worker succeeds in locating a husband or father, and he comes in for an interview, the Agency has failed to give the worker help in working with him. This is illustrated in case No. 18, where the grant has continued almost without interruption from 1946. When the father of the children was seen in 1958, the interview is recorded in seven lines and consists of a discussion of his employment and address. There is frequently a sense of anticlimax, as though the interview with the fathers was of less importance than all that

had preceded it. This is apparent when records are read in their entirety; and when the efforts of the Agency to talk with fathers indicates that it has had little meaning for the father or for the child.

It also seems apparent from the records read that many fathers are stronger and more effective persons than the mothers. These fathers frequently show a strong early interest in and concern for their children. As the mothers continue to receive assistance this interest seems to fade away, or, if the interest of the father does continue, the Agency is not aware of it.

a. Husband willing to live with and support family: It is not the intent of the Agency to provide assistance in behalf of children when this responsibility can be assumed by their father. When there is evidence that a father out of the home is willing to live with and support his family and when it is believed that this offer will benefit the children, the mother is not eligible for assistance because of her unwillingness to permit the husband to return to the home. This policy grew out of long experience of the Agency with mothers who claimed their husbands were out of the home and unwilling to support, when this was found not to be true.

Eleven cases were found where the Agency had failed to communicate with the husband, or to determine his willingness to provide for his family.

Case No. 11. Miss D was 19 when she applied for assistance in October 1956. She said she had been married to Mr. S in May, but he did not want her to use his name. There was no discussion of her relationship with Mr. S. Mr. W, who Miss D said was the father of her two children was interviewed promptly concerning his plans and ability to support. On November 26, 1956, Mr. S called and came to the office the following day. "He stated he could not understand why Agency would be considering an assistance plan with his wife since he is employed and is willing to provide a home and support her and his stepchildren to whom he is quite devoted." Mr. S, who was 55, said Miss D left him soon after their marriage. He objected to her keeping late hours. He assured worker of his desire to support his family and of his ability to do this. She had refused a reconciliation. After further interview with Miss D and her husband, the application was terminated.

When Miss D reapplied in December 1957, she said her sister and her mother could not continue supporting her and the children. The only references to her husband are the following: "Miss D states that her husband offered support to her and the children during December 1956. She states there has been no contact with him since their telephone conversation during that month * * *." "She stated that she found it impossible to get along with her husband because he quarreled all the time because people told him she was going with another man. She stated that her husband had never caught her with another man although she was going steady with Mr. H. from 1953 until October 1957 * * *." There is no other reference to Mr. S although he was located by I.S.

Cases No. 14 and No. 17 illustrate situations in which the father is willing to live with and support his family, but the grant is continued. For summary of these cases, see Attachment No. 7.

One of the purposes of the ADC program is to help maintain and strengthen family life and to help parents to attain the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection.

There is evidence in the records read that this purpose is not always carried out; that family life is often weakened rather than

strengthened, and that recipients are not helped in a responsible way to attain the maximum self-support and independence, that the mothers and the fathers expect the agency to lift the burden of support from their shoulders, and that the agency does this.

b. Eligibility requirements other than need not met. While financial need is the basic requirement for assistance, it is only one requirement, and Agency policy does not permit the authorization of assistance on that basis alone. There is evidence in the records read that payments are made because the workers are convinced that need exists, without recognition that all people in need are not entitled to assistance.

Cases Nos. 25, 40, 17 and 42 are examples of assistance being authorized in disregard of policy.

Case No. 25. When Mrs. J. applied on June 13, 1958 she said she had no child care plan. She had received an allotment from Mr. J. until his discharge May 1, 1958. Two years ago she began a relationship with a Mr. C., she said, which ended in May 1958. She wants to work but felt that an effective child care plan should be worked out. There was no discussion of care by Mrs. J's mother, although when a home visit was made on July 9, 1958, the older child was in the grandmother's home and when a visit was made October 2, 1958, the grandmother was in Mrs. J's home. On October 2, 1958, Mrs. J. said her mother would stay with the children and this would be better than depending on assistance. Mrs. J. said she refused to accompany her husband to Louisiana where he was stationed when in the service. She said he had returned to the District of Columbia and she saw him frequently but claimed not to know his address. I.S. located Mr. J. on August 12, 1958. Letters were written to him on August 27 and September 12 but no other action taken. I.S. reported that Mrs. J. was "never home." A child care plan seemed to be available. The husband and father is employed in the District but has never been interviewed. The entry on form No. 122 dated September 18, 1958 is "Case will be referred to I.S. at a later date."

Case No. 40. Miss S applied March 21, 1958, because of pregnancy. She said the father of her two children was Mr. I with whom she had lived from 1954 to 1956. The father of her unborn child was Mr. L. She said her relationship with him began in July 1957 and ended December 1957. He was a tenant at the same address. On May 2, 1958, Miss S said she planned to return to work. An entry on April 30, 1958, says it was decided to talk with Mr. L before approval of application. There is no dictation after May 2, 1958. I.S. reports that when they were in the home Mr. L was bringing in the trash can. Miss S, pretending not to know who he was, asked him his name. On form No. 122, under "Action and Result of I.S. Report" the following entry, dated September 10, 1958, is made: "Assistance continued pending interview with Mr. L."

In Case No. 17, Mrs. J's statements that her husband was responsible for her pregnancy were disproved but assistance was continued in August 1958 "because she was so greatly in need."

In Case No. 42, assistance was authorized and continued with no effort to contact the husband or the other fathers of the children.

c. Women in control: It was noted in a number of cases that the mothers seemed to be in control, not only of their family situations, without participation by the husbands, but were able to control the Agency as well and to receive assistance on their own terms. This control is accomplished in many ways; by temper, by arrogance, by the ability to make the Agency uncertain and uncomfortable, and by sheer persistence. Perhaps these mothers are seeking in the Agency some individual who can be firm and whom they are not able to control. They

seem constantly to be exploring and testing the Agency, seeking limits they cannot control.

The ability of women to control the Agency and to receive assistance on their own terms seems more true when the mothers are very young and when they are described as "dull" or "limited."

Cases Nos. 14, 16, 17, 29, and 47 illustrate the unwillingness of mothers to relinquish the assistance grant after their husbands are released from hospitals or institutions or are willing to return to the home. When application is made, the woman frequently tells the Agency that her husband worked regularly and supported adequately. This story is often changed and the Agency is told that she does not want her husband back, and that he never supported adequately.

Case No. 29. When Miss B applied on December 30, 1949, she said her baby was ill and she could not work because the landlord was no longer able to care for the children. She was reported to be an excellent worker. The father of both children was given as Mr. J, who was in a VA hospital in Virginia. Miss B said that Mr. M was the father of her child born in 1950. On January 16, 1951, Mr. M telephoned. He said he was a cook, was married and could not support regularly. The case was closed in March 1951 because Miss B received a lump sum from VA. She applied again in May 1951 saying the money was all gone. On March 25, 1952, Miss B and her youngest daughter, born January 11, 1952, were in the office. She said she "was not ashamed of the fact that her children were born out of wedlock as it could happen to any woman unless she kept to herself." She said that Corporal H was the father of her youngest child. However, on July 10, 1953, he was found by juvenile court "not guilty." Miss B had told the Agency on October 27, 1952, that Corporal H had denied the paternity and had said he would not contribute unless she continued to have relations with him. On May 28, 1954, a rent receipt was noted in the name of Mary L. She said this was the name of her boyfriend, Frederick L, who was in the Armed Forces. Miss B was married to Mr. L on November 12, 1954, and the case was closed. On May 15, 1956, she reapplied, saying that Mr. L had left her. Mr. L told the Agency on June 18, 1956, that he had left at Mrs. L's insistence and would return. They agreed to go back together. On June 25, 1956, Mr. L was in the office. He said that Mrs. L would rather receive assistance than to have him return. The application was terminated because of no continued absence. Mrs. L came in on January 18, 1957, to say that her husband had been absent since August 1956. On February 12, 1957, she said he drank, wouldn't support, and she locked him out. On February 18, 1957, Mr. L said she had locked him out. She is never satisfied with what he does for her. When they were together and he came home, she was either out or getting ready to go out. She told him she could do better without him. On one occasion when he protested, she struck him with an iron pipe. Mr. L said she had a friend named George, and he had seen him in the home. Mrs. L said later he was only a "family friend." No further contact was made with Mr. L. On May 21, 1957, Mrs. L complained that the Agency had too many restrictions. When asked what she meant by this, she said, "You can't do this and you can't do that and the Welfare always wants to know all about your business." She said she "likes to be independent and do as she pleases, not having to explain things to anyone." She said she was "through with men." An explanation of Agency policy regarding absence was recorded for the first time. On March 18, 1958, Mrs. L said she was pregnant and that Mr. E was the father of the unborn child. She used to meet him at tourist homes, but the relationship has been discontinued.

Referral was made to I.S. July 16, 1958, to determine whether a family relationship exists between the client and Mr. E.

On July 24, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. L was pregnant and on September 3 that no man was seen in the home.

The following notation is made by the social worker on form No. 122, "Since no evidence was found of paramour, assistance was continued. We were aware of Mrs. L's pregnancy."

See also cases Nos. 14 and 17 summarized in attachment No. 7.

8. Information supplied by investigation service not always helpful.

There were instances in which information supplied by I.S. was not of value to the worker.

For example, in case No. 21, the worker was concerned about the continuing relationship between Miss H and Mr. B who is the father of two children and who, according to Miss H, had asked her to marry him. She said Mr. B "knows better than to visit her in her home, and gave as the reason that Agency would not allow her to have male visitors." She said she sees him at his apartment when she visits her sister who lives two doors from Mr. B. On June 30, 1958, I.S. was asked to determine the extent of Miss H and Mr. B's relationship and to determine if Miss H had access to Mr. B's apartment. The investigation was terminated with no information supplied as to Miss H's visits to Mr. B's apartment.

In case No. 46, Mrs. W's friend was seen in the home asleep. I.S. did not awaken the man or check his address as is usually done.

In case No. 44, I.S. was asked to visit after 10 p.m. to see who was frequenting the home. The investigation was inadequate and visits were not made as requested.

In other cases, I.S. interim reports clearly show that a man has access to the home, yet the final report is that no evidence is found.

Case No. 18 is an example of this. Mr. E was the father of several of Mrs. G's children. I.S. found him in the home on May 26, 1958, yet the final report of July 17, 1958, says, "No man has access" and form No. 122 is checked, "No evidence found."

In case No. 7, I.S. was asked to locate Mr. A, with whom Miss B said she had been having marital relations, and to determine if a family relationship existed with Mr. A or any man. On September 16, 1958, I.S. reported on form No. 197 that Mr. A had been located at the Marine Base in Camp Lejeune, N.C. Form No. 122 was checked to show that evidence was found of a paramour's presence in the home.

In case No. 29, the I.S. reported September 3, 1958, that no man was found in the home. Form No. 122 was checked "No evidence found." These reports have little meaning in cases such as this, where Mrs. L has had 6 illegitimate pregnancies by 4 different men while receiving assistance.

B. Comparison of 29 cases submitted by investigation service with findings of study.

1. Review of eight cases submitted by I.S. February 9, 1958, in which evidence appeared to indicate assistance should be discontinued.

On February 9, 1959, I.S. submitted a list of eight cases "in which evidence appears to indicate that assistance should be discontinued," and a list of 21 cases "in which evidence appears to indicate that if assistance was not discontinued, cases should have been referred to I.S. giving specific requests for followup action." Investigation Service noted that this second group consists of two categories: One, where the social worker talks with the recipient and believes her story that absence exists and, two, the social worker cannot make a definite finding on the information furnished by I.S. or contained in the record. Investigation Service believed such cases should be re-referred by the social worker, with a request for specific information needed for a definite finding.

The eight cases in which I.S. believed assistance should be discontinued were reviewed and compared with the findings of the study as to whether or not the continuation of assistance was justified. In four of these cases, the findings of the study were the same as that by I.S.—that the continuation of assistance was not justified. In one of the four other cases where the finding of the study was that the continuation of assistance was justified, assistance was to continue only for a 3-month period and then the case was to be closed because absence no longer existed. In the second case, case No. 19, the study showed that the continuation of assistance was justified, not on the basis of absence, but because of physical incapacity. The third case was case No. 4, a most difficult situation cited elsewhere in the study where it was decided that the continuation of assistance was justified because of the problems in the case and because the case had been referred to a higher supervisory level for a decision. In the fourth case, No. 26, the decision on the basis of the study was that the continuation of assistance was justified although continued absence was not clearly established, but the worker was not justified in discontinuing assistance without followup. In this case, application for assistance was not made until June 1958. Mrs. K said she had lived with her husband until April 1958 when they were forced to move and she had rented an apartment in her own name and Mr. K had gone to live with his mother. Referral was made to I.S. on June 20, 1958, to determine if Mr. K had free access to the home. On August 7, 1958, I.S. reported that a Mr. Y had been found in the home. Mrs. K told the investigators that her children go to Mr. K's place each morning for breakfast. On August 12, 1958, I.S. reported that they visited the home on Sunday at 10 a.m. and had been told by a woman who was looking after the baby that Mrs. K and the children were at their grandmother's. The investigation was closed as evidence indicated that the recipient is in regular contact with Mr. K. Mr. K had told the agency that Mrs. K has a friend who plays the role of father to his children. He said Mrs. K drinks and cares little for the children. Mr. K's mother said neither parent cares for the children properly. When the worker talked with Mrs. K about the relationship between Mr. K and his children, she said there were close family ties. There would appear to be real question that continued absence exists when the children are in such close contact with the father and when the mother also has contacts with the father. In finding that the continuation of assistance was justified, it was believed that re-referral should be made to I.S. and that the relationship with Mr. K and Mr. Y be cleared. It is noted that in July 1958 the agency pointed out to Mr. and Mrs. K that the agency cannot assume support of children when their parents are able to do so, yet the agency has continued to do this. This may well be a separation of convenience.

2. Review of 21 cases Investigation Service believes should have been re-referred.

The 21 cases where I.S. believed evidence appeared to indicate that if assistance was not discontinued, the cases should have been referred back to I.S., were compared with the findings of the study. Of these 21 cases, the study showed—

Continuation of assistance not justified. 13
Continuation of assistance justified. 8

Of the eight cases, the study showed that continued absence was not clearly established, and further follow-up was needed. In only one was re-referral made to I.S. In the remaining seven, the study showed re-referral should have been made.

From this comparison of I.S. recommendations and the findings of the study, it was

found that the two are in substantial agreement.

C. Summary of findings:

1. Attention is directed to the fact that the cases read in this study represent only 49 out of a total caseload of 3,589 cases active in December 1958, or less than 1.4 percent.

2. No "frequent" disagreement was found between Investigation Service findings and the action taken by the social-service staff. Of the 531 cases included in the study, I.S. questioned only 29.

3. The basic element of disagreement was found to be in relation to the continuation of assistance in cases where I.S. believed the eligibility requirement of continued absence did not exist.

4. Information provided by Investigation Service has been used by staff in determining both eligibility and ineligibility. Of the 330 cases in which information had been requested as to presence in the home, no evidence was found in 133 cases. One hundred and sixteen cases were closed or the application denied prior to the study, 53 of them because absence was not found to exist.

5. In more than half of the 49 cases, it was believed that the continuation of assistance was not justified. In only two cases was it believed that the continuation of assistance was justified without further follow-up.

6. The decision to terminate an investigation seems to be made in most cases by I.S. alone without any communication or discussion with the social worker as to whether he wishes the investigation to be continued.

7. The manual provides for a conference to be arranged with appropriate persons, "when questions arise in the process of an investigation." No record was found of such conferences, although it is possible that they were held and were not recorded.

8. In at least six cases, the I.S. reports were not found in the case records. In instances of "current" and "retired" case records, I.S. reports were sometimes in the "current" record, sometimes in the "retired" record, and sometimes scattered between the two records.

9. In most cases the procedure established for referral to and reporting by I.S. were followed.

10. In a number of cases referral was made to I.S. before action was taken on information already available.

11. Assistance was frequently continued where absence was not clearly established and no re-referral to I.S. was made.

12. There was indication in the records read that clients are aware of I.S.'s method of working, time of visiting, etc., and visit with men in the men's living quarters or elsewhere.

13. Mothers are able to make the Agency uncomfortable and uncertain and to receive assistance on their own terms.

14. It is difficult for the staff to cope with the complex problems in some of the ADC cases, to hold themselves and the client's to Agency policies.

15. It is difficult for the staff to carry adequately responsibility for evaluating the information already in case records or supplied by I.S.

16. Some cases show complete disregard of information supplied by I.S., as well as of Agency policy. This was found to be true when referral was made to a higher level for decision, as well as in other cases.

17. The staff is caught between conflicting pressures to provide assistance promptly to persons in need and of making a determination that need exists. Assistance is frequently authorized before any real effort is made, either by the client or the Agency, to locate the fathers who are supposed to be "absent."

18. The staff needs help in working with both mothers and fathers around the eligibility factor of continued absence, so that

the interest of the fathers in their children is rekindled or sustained, and does not decline as assistance continued.

19. There is evidence that, once assistance is granted, the mothers prefer this and go to any lengths to see that it continues. The records indicate that—

a. The amount of the assistance payment is greater than husbands or paramours are able to earn,

b. The payment is more regular than the money received from husbands or paramours,

c. The mothers have complete control over the way the payment is spent, in contrast to earnings supplied by husband or paramour.

d. The mothers make every effort to convince the Agency of their continuing eligibility and, at the same time, continue the relationships which, if known to the Agency, would make them ineligible.

e. Advantage is gained from both the assistance payments and the earnings of husbands or paramours.

20. Many records show frequent moving from place to place and nearly always at increased cost. In almost no instance did the record show why the recipient moved, how moving costs or the new rent were paid, or

that the new address and living arrangements were verified in accordance with Agency policy.

21. Clients are permitted to move from the home of relatives without contact by the Agency with the relative to verify that the client is required to move or why. This seems to be particularly true where the clients are very young and where supervision of their behavior is indicated.

22. The clients' statements and explanations are often accepted at face value, in spite of repeated evidence of falsification and deception.

23. The procedures established for seeking support from fathers in the Armed Forces are not followed.

24. The records reveal surprising evidence of well-being. There were references to the fact that children were well dressed, to expensive appliances and televisions, to the purchase of clothing and furniture in amounts of several hundreds of dollars, and to bicycles and "other expensive toys." There were also references to "good" meals being prepared by the recipients when visits were made.

PAD No. 122
Rev. 12/58

ATTACHMENT No. 1

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE,

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE DIVISION

Report on Investigation Service

Name of client _____		I.S. No. _____		Race: W N O	
1. Request by social worker _____		Category and case No. _____		Active case <input type="checkbox"/> Appl <input type="checkbox"/>	
II. Information furnished by I.S.		II. Information furnished by I.S.			
A. Locate—		A. Located _____			
1. Husband _____ (number)		Evidence found _____			
2. Paramour _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
3. Mother _____		Not located _____			
4. Other: Specify _____		Evidence found _____			
B. Information on presence in the home of—		B. Evidence found _____			
1. Husband _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
2. Paramour _____		No evidence found _____			
3. Male visitors _____		Evidence found _____			
4. Other: Specify _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
C. Information on resources—		C. Evidence found _____			
1. Real estate ownership _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
2. Car ownership _____		No evidence found _____			
3. Employment _____		Evidence found _____			
4. Business activity _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
5. Illegal activity _____		No evidence found _____			
6. Roomers _____		Evidence found _____			
7. Other: Specify _____		Withdrawn by S.W. _____			
D. Other service requested (specify) _____		D. _____			
II. E. Refusal to sign PAD No. 77: Reason _____		_____			
II. F. Incidental information developed by I.S. _____		_____			
Social worker _____		Date I.S. report _____			
Date S.W. memo _____		To S.W. _____			
Date of receipt of S.W. memo _____		_____			
Investigator _____		_____			
122 Partial _____		Final _____			
Return 122 to Chief, I.S., by _____					
II. ACTION TAKEN BY SOCIAL WORKER					
A. Application: _____					
1. Approved: _____; amount \$ _____					
2. Denied: _____; code reason for denial _____; date _____					
3. Still pending _____					
B. Case: _____					
1. Assistance continued unchanged, amount \$ _____					
2. Assistance increased; date _____; from \$ _____ to \$ _____					
3. Assistance decreased; date _____; from \$ _____ to \$ _____					
4. Assistance suspended: Case not closed, amount \$ _____; date suspended _____; date case last opened _____					
5. Assistance suspended: Code reason for closing _____; amount \$ _____; Date suspended _____; date case last opened _____					
6. Assistance reinstated _____; amount \$ _____					
ACTION AND RESULTS ON NONSUPPORT					
Inapplicable because—					
0. No man involved.					
1. Man already supporting.					
2. Man's whereabouts unknown.					
3. Time for filing complaint expired.					
4. Case closed or application denied.					
5. Other: specify _____					
6. Voluntary agreement signed: date _____; amount \$ _____					
7. Referral to juvenile court: date _____					
a. Support ordered: amount \$ _____					
b. Bench warrant issued.					
c. Other action: specify _____					
8. Referral to district attorney: specify action _____					
9. Action by PAD staff pending: note reason _____					

Action and results on I.S. report:

ATTACHMENT 2.—Forms 122—July, August, September, 1958

Location of person.....	172
Information on location only.....	140
Other information submitted.....	32
Case closed or application denied.....	19
Case not closed.....	13
Resources and other requests.....	29
Closed or suspended.....	12
No evidence found.....	11
Evidence found—not closed.....	6
Presence in the home.....	330
No evidence found.....	133
Closed or application denied.....	116
Cases not closed.....	81
Total.....	531

ATTACHMENT 3.—Request by social worker for information relating to the presence in the home of husband, paramour, or other person

No evidence found.....	133
Case closed or application denied.....	116
Cases not closed.....	81
Withdrawn by social worker.....	7
Withdrawn by I.S.....	2
Evidence found.....	45
Grant suspended.....	11
Application held pending.....	4
Grant continued.....	30
OAA.....	2
GPA.....	1
ADC.....	27
Record not located.....	1
No evidence found on specific reason for referral but other information submitted.....	27
Grant suspended.....	2
Grant continued.....	25
ATD.....	1
GPA.....	1
ADC.....	23
Records read and schedules prepared:	
Evidence found.....	26
Evidence not found on specific reason for referral but other information submitted.....	23
Subtotal.....	49
Total.....	330

ATTACHMENT 4.—SCHEDULE FOR STUDY OF ADC CASES IN WHICH INVESTIGATION SERVICE BELIEVES TO HAVE MADE A POSITIVE REPORT ON ACCESS TO THE HOME YET ASSISTANCE WAS CONTINUED—NOVEMBER 1958

Case name.....	case number.....
A. Date of referral to I.S.....	Raco: W-N-O.
B. Reason for referral:	
1. To obtain new information.	
2. To confirm absence or presence where not clearly shown.	
3. To confirm absence or presence although clearly shown.	
4. To investigate current situation in cases previously closed because absence was not established.	
5. To investigate current situation in cases where previous I.S. report or case record indicates man had access to home.	
6. Other (specify).....	
C. Relationship to woman of man found in home:	
1. Husband; paramour.	
2. Father of one or more children.	
3. Father of none.	
4. Other (specify).....	
D. Date of report by I.S. requiring action by social worker.....	

E. Action by social worker:

1. Discussion of I.S. report with woman and/or man—date.....
2. Referred to unit and/or District supervisor for decision—date.....
3. Re-referred to I.S.—date.....
4. Other (specify).....
- F. Recorded reason assistance was continued; denied of relationship by recipient:
 1. Re-referral not indicated. Re-referral seems indicated.
 2. Referral made.
 3. Referral not made. Change in recipient's situation concurrent with I.S. Report:
 4. Man in jail or hospital.
 5. Man left District of Columbia.
 6. Mother out of home—change in grantee relative.
 7. Man's unemployability verified.
 8. Other (specify).....
- Report returned to I.S. before final action has been taken.
9. Referred to higher supervisory level.
10. Other (specify).....
11. Inapplicable because man a relative or other person not connected with family.
- G. Was referral to I.S. justified?

- Yes—
1. Continued absence not clearly established
2. Other (specify).....
- No—
3. Adequate information for decision in case record ineligible under Agency policy before referral
4. No continued absence
5. Eligibility not affected by "Access"
6. Man physically or mentally incapacitated
7. Other (specify).....
8. Other (specify).....
- H. Was continuation of assistance justified?
- Yes—
1. Explanation by recipient and followup by worker clearly establish continued absence
2. Continued absence not clearly established, but worker not justified in discontinuing assistance without further follow-up
3. Eligibility not affected by access
4. Incidental information provided by I.S. does not affect eligibility after followup by social worker
- No—
- Continued absence not established
1. Man's intimate relationship with woman clearly established
2. Man found in home 2 or more times
3. Record gives evidence of unconvincing explanations by client
4. Other (specify).....

1. Other action indicated related to continued absence
1. Effort to locate or communicate with husband
2. Re-referral to I.S.
3. Other (specify).....
- Remarks:.....

ATTACHMENT 5.—EXAMPLES OF DIFFICULT SITUATIONS AND ATTITUDES WITH WHICH THE INVESTIGATION SERVICE AND SOCIAL SERVICE MUST WORK

CASE NO. 28

August 24, 1953: Mrs. L applied for herself and two children. She said her allotment had stopped because her husband was AWOL. She was pregnant by Robert J. who was interviewed September 1, 1953 and agreed to support. There was no discussion recorded of a continuing relationship or of agency policy. When Mr. L was interviewed, he said he would support. He said he had no plans to live with his wife. He said his wife had purchased a 1947 Cadillac. Mrs. L said she had permitted Mr. Y to buy a car in her name.

December 7, 1953: Mrs. L's mother, who had been known to the agency under several different names, said Mrs. L is continuing her relationship with Mr. J and that she spends the grant foolishly.

March 10, 1955: Mrs. L said she was pregnant by Mr. J and that her relationship with him has continued. When Mr. J was interviewed, he said he felt sorry for Mrs. L. He does not want his child on relief. He said the Agency had no right to question his relationship with Mrs. L as this was a personal matter.

April 22, 1955: Mrs. L was told she was no longer eligible for assistance and the case was closed.

January 1956: Mrs. L reapplied. She said that Mr. J had died, she has no boy friend and she does not intend to have any more children.

February 24, 1958: Mrs. L is pregnant by Mr. W. She said she had been seeing him for a year. Mrs. L readily accepted the fact when it was explained that her March check would probably "be her last check." Case is discussed with supervisor: "Free access of the man from the home cannot be established since Mr. W is stationed at Bolling Field in Washington. Therefore absence cannot be established and assistance will be discontinued."

April 1, 1959: Check canceled. However, the April 1 check was reinstated with no reason given and the grant continued.

June 12, 1958: Mrs. L wanted "to know her limits." She also wanted to know how long I.S. would be visiting.

May 1958: Referral was made to I.S. regarding Mr. W, but a Mr. R was found in the home. The address he gave was found to be an empty house. There is no further mention in the record of Mr. W. There is no record of an interview with him.

In 1957 there is an entry in the record that Mr. L is the paramour of another ADC mother who has had three children by him.

Case No. 47. In this case, which is 76 pages long, the Agency learned on October 17, 1951, that Mrs. W. had given birth to a child on October 3, 1951. (Mrs. W. had been seen on September 25, 1951, and employment discussed. There was no mention of pregnancy.) Mr. T. was named as the father. An entry, dated December 5, 1951, said the check was released with the understanding that Mrs. W. would have Mr. T. come to the office. He was not seen until December 1952. There is no record of any discussion with him then, except support.

In 1955, Mrs. W. named Mr. D as the father of her child born September 10, 1955. In October 1955, the worker recorded—"I also asked Mrs. W. if she were continuing her relationship with Mr. D., and she said she really did not know * * *"

A letter was received from Mrs. W., saying she had broken off with Mr. D. and had nothing else to do with him. On December 2, 1955, Mr. D. was seen. He said he was disgusted with Mrs. W. for not wanting to keep his child that he had stopped seeing her in January or February and there has been no relationship between them since that time. "They both promised to contact us if they decided to resume their relationship."

In October 1956 a furniture company reported that Mrs. W. had bought \$516.00 worth of furniture, increased the debt to \$560.00, and had made monthly payments of \$30.00 until July 1955. (The worker noted that Mr. T. came into Mrs. W's life in 1955—and that she had said the furniture belonged to her mother.) On April 13, 1957, the worker notes that a man has been seen in Mrs. W's home several times, whom Mrs. W. said was her uncle.

In May 1957, the case was closed because Mrs. W. went to work. She reapplied in August 1958 and referral was made to I.S. to determine that Mr. D. is continuously absent. On September 18, 1958, I.S. reported finding

Mr. D. in the home. The following entry, dated November 5, 1958, is made on form No. 122: "Assistance continued pending interview with Mrs. W. and Mr. D."

Case No. 48. Mrs. W. had received assistance since 1949. In August 1953 the Agency learned she was pregnant by Mr. L. He was seen in October 1953 and agreed to give Mrs. W. \$6.00 each week.

In 1954 a department store reported that Mrs. W. had purchased clothing amounting to \$140.95. The store was informed that "We took no responsibility for what our recipients did." Mrs. W. moved frequently, no questions were raised as to how moving costs or rent were paid, and living arrangements were not satisfactorily verified.

In January 1956, the Agency learned that Mrs. W. had given birth to a male infant. When Mrs. W. and Mr. I were seen in February 1956, Mr. I said he planned to marry someone else and would be unable to provide for the children. He said later he would support and that the Agency had no right to know his business. In March the case was closed. Mrs. W. appealed and the action of the Agency was sustained. Mrs. W. said she had known that by bringing Mr. L. to the Agency she was not eligible for further assistance, she would have brought some other man and said he was the father. In May she applied again, and both she and Mr. L. said their relationship was continuing. However, he was seen in the home in June, and the application was terminated. In September 1956, Mrs. W. was referred to CWD, became pregnant again by Mr. L. and the case was again closed in March 1958. Her last application was in May 1958. She denied any further relationship with Mr. L. Referral was made to Investigation Service on June 6, 1958, to determine if Mr. L. is absent from the home. On July 8, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. W. said she had never heard of Mr. L. "When it was pointed out that this was not true, recipient readily admitted this, but stated she felt it was not necessary to tell investigators things that don't concern them. Recipient then began speaking in a loud belligerent voice and would not be interrupted in her harangue." Investigation Service suggested that the social worker should interview Mrs. W. with the investigator present, and that unless she cooperated, no purpose would be served by further home visits. On August 6, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. W. was not at home when visited. The final report, dated August 18, 1958, points out that Mrs. W. has not given correct information as to persons living in the household and that "this closes investigation by Investigation Service." No information was obtained concerning Mr. L.'s presence or absence in the home.

CASE NO. 49

When Mrs. W. applied for assistance in 1955 she was 18 years old and had three children. She was 15 when she married Mr. W, he was 17. She said Mr. W. had deserted. In 1956 Mrs. W.'s mother complained that she was "running the streets," sometimes stayed out all night, and made no plans for care of the children. In May 1956, Mr. W, who was not yet 20, was interviewed at the jail. He said he had not deserted. His wife and children had gone to her mother's home when he was out of work, and he had refused to go there. He said he had supported himself since he was 14 and could do several kinds of work. He had been a ward of CWD. He said he planned to return to his family. In May 1956, Mrs. W.'s behavior and drinking were discussed. She said she felt her behavior was due to Mr. W.'s incarceration and that she "just can't wait" for him to be released. Mr. W. was released and returned to his family. He was made payee, which made Mrs. W. angry. In August 1956, Mr. W. obtained work. Both Mr. and Mrs. W. as-

sured the worker they did not consider themselves separated, and the case was closed.

In May 1957, Mrs. W. reapplied, saying Mr. W. had deserted. She talked "loudly and snappily" with worker, and paid little attention to the worker's explanation regarding efforts to locate Mr. W. and to obtain support. The record says Mr. W. has "a history of irresponsibility, incarceration and failure to support" but the record does not bear this out. On September 22, 1957, Mrs. W. called to ask that her case be closed because she was working. The agency learned later that she began working July 18, 1957.

In March 1958, Mrs. W. applied again. She said she was laid off at HEW. It was learned that she had lost her job because of too frequent absences due to illness and her work was not satisfactory. She said she had been separated from Mr. W. for a year and had been going with a Mr. B. She was demanding and controlling. The worker notes in referral to I.S. Mrs. W. is very unpleasant. "I believe she is mentally disturbed." In May 1958, a man from the realty company called to say that Mrs. W. had moved in the middle of the night, that a man helped her move, and that he thinks the man stayed all night.

In June 1957, referral was made to locate Mr. W. Investigation Service reported they could not locate Mrs. W. Referral to I.S. was made May 26, 1958, to determine whether a family relationship existed with any man. Investigation Service reported they were not admitted to the home, that Mrs. W. was not at home on the last two visits and that no evidence was found of male access. On form No. 122, I.S. noted: "Possible neglect of children." The form was returned to I.S. with no notation by the social worker, except that the grant continued unchanged.

CASE NO. 15

Mrs. E. told the Agency in 1951 that Mr. E. had deserted 6 years before. In 1956 (after Mrs. E.'s fifth application since 1933) I.S. reported that Mr. E. was employed, that his address was the same as Mrs. E.'s and that he claimed five dependents for income tax purposes. Mr. and Mrs. E. denied living together and the grant continued.

In 1958 Mrs. E. was forced to move from NOHA because of the illegal sale of alcohol. (The father of one of her children had told the agency in 1956 that Mrs. E. did not need assistance, that Mrs. E. was selling liquor and numbers.) In September 1958, I.S. reported no evidence of liquor sale or access.

Case No. 16: Mrs. F. told the Agency on August 7, 1953, that if her husband was able to work and to return home, she would be pleased to have him, since he had always supported and worked regularly. In 1957, on two occasions, she said he had never supported adequately. Mr. F. claimed his wife did not want him back because she was interested in someone else.

Case No. 31: Investigation Service found Mr. M in Miss L's home. She said he was her cousin, not her boyfriend. She admitted later that he was her boyfriend and that she had tried to conceal this information from the Agency.

Case No. 37: Referral was made to I.S. to determine the relationship of Mrs. M and Mr. A. When I.S. visited in September 1958 Mr. A. answered the door. Mrs. M said Mr. A. visited every day because she was in arrears with her rent, and he had rented the house for her. New men's suits were found in the closet. The grant continues, with the notation on form No. 122 that I.S. report did not reveal conclusive evidence of Mr. A.'s having free access to the client's home. Mrs. M showed worker that she had altered the new suits to fit her young sons.

ATTACHMENT 6—ACTION TAKEN BY SOCIAL WORKER ON INFORMATION PROVIDED BY INVESTIGATION SERVICE

Report discussed with client.....	24
In less than 1 month.....	15
In less than 2 months.....	6
In less than 3 months.....	1
In less than 4 months.....	1
Date not recorded, but record mentions discussion.....	1
Letters written to arrange interview.....	4
Action taken prior to I.S. report.....	1
No action required.....	7
No action recorded.....	13
Total.....	49

ATTACHMENT 7—EXAMPLES OF PREFERENCE OF MOTHERS FOR ASSISTANCE RATHER THAN SUPPORT FROM HUSBAND

Case No. 14: Mrs. E., age 23, applied for assistance for herself and four children in July 1952, saying Mr. E. had been incarcerated for non-support. She said Mr. E. had been fairly reliable until about 3 years ago when he started drinking and staying out nights. They were married in April 1947; the oldest child was born in January 1947. Mrs. E.'s fifth child was born in 1953. She said she was not going to permit her husband to live with her again after his release. On May 8, 1953, Mr. E. was visited at the District jail. He said he was anxious to return to his family and support them, but Mrs. E. had written him of her desire for a divorce. After Mr. E. was released, Mr. and Mrs. E. were seen at the office May 19, 1953. Mr. E. felt that his children should not receive assistance, as long as he was able-bodied and can work and care for them. He accused Mrs. E. of running the streets all hours of the night and not looking after the children as a mother should. He gave the car license number of the car belonging to a man she was "running around with." Mrs. E. said the car belonged to Mr. A., a friend of hers. On a visit to the home on February 10, 1953, worker had seen an elderly man mopping the kitchen floor. In June 1953, Mr. E. obtained employment. He complained about Mrs. E.'s behavior, her care of the children, and her threat to put him back in jail, and how difficult Mrs. E. makes it for him to see the children. The worker talked with Mrs. E. in July about giving Mr. E. "an opportunity to prove himself," but she was unwilling. In November 1953, when a visit was made, an "old gentleman" was sitting in the kitchen with the children. Mrs. E. was dressed to go out and a young man came in, and was introduced as Mr. O. The worker again talked about permitting Mr. E. to return. The worker remarked that "sometimes it might be easier to depend on the Agency rather than to give her husband an opportunity to prove that she could depend on him." Mr. and Mrs. E. were again seen together at the office. Mr. E. said he is making \$82.72 every 2 weeks, that he loved his wife and children and wanted to support them. He worked steadily and tried to show his wife that he had changed. He said he could support the family on his salary "if she would listen to reason and let him come home." He thought it would be possible to reason with Mrs. E. "If she did not feel so independent of him." He said he could not understand why his wife and children needed assistance, when he was willing to return and give the family advantage of all his earnings. He said "as long as his wife could get public assistance she wouldn't listen to anything he had to say." After conference with the supervisor, the worker told Mrs. E. she was not eligible for continued assistance, because of Mr. E.'s offer to support in the home. In December Mr. E. said he had thought about it and did not want to return home. "He

thinks they could not get along and thinks he might end up in jail." The grant continued. In February 1954, Mrs. E. said Mr. E was picked up on his job for nonsupport and lost his job because of being held in jail. In March 1954 Mrs. E. was pregnant by Mr. A., lost the baby, and said she was still "keeping company" with Mr. A. During the interview, Mr. A. came to visit Mrs. E. Mr. A. said he would take care of any children born to them. In March 1955, Mrs. E. said she had no further relationship with Mr. A. In May 1956, a Mr. R. came to complain about Mrs. E.'s neglect of the children, and spending money she gets from the Agency on herself. Mr. R. said Mrs. E. is pregnant by him. He has stayed with Mrs. E.

He has offered to marry her and care for the children, "but she wants to be free to run the streets." He said she drinks heavily. Mrs. E. denied any relationship with Mr. R. or pregnancy. In September there was a discussion with Mrs. E. as to her behavior, parties, etc. She said she was "ready to settle down and plan for her children and stop running around." In October Mrs. E. was evicted by NCHA. Although her back rent was paid by "some men," she had been a problem and disturbance over a period of years. A Mr. Y was seen in the home in October 1956 and January 1957. In January and March, Investigation Service reported finding a Mr. J in the home. In April 1957 and again in January 1958, Mrs. E. was told that a relationship with a man similar to that of husband and wife might jeopardize the grant. She said she was well aware of this policy.

In April 1958 Investigation Service located Mr. E. In August 1958, Mr. E. came to the office on his own accord. He signed a voluntary support agreement. He again said he would like to make a home for his family, but "would not want to return to the home unless Mrs. E. accepted him on her own." On August 13, 1958, Information Service found Mr. B in the home, and a Mr. L staggered in from the street. Mr. L had come staggering in on a previous Information Service visit. On August 18, 1958, Mrs. E. said Mr. B was a friend she hadn't seen for 6 years. She would not consider going back with Mr. E. He would leave her and take trips with other women, and stay away from home drunk. On October 6, 1958, Mrs. E. said that he had moved and her rent had been increased to \$65 plus heating oil and utilities. She was reminded of the Agency maximum of \$64 for all shelter costs, and she said she could manage.

CASE NO. 17

When Mrs. J applied for assistance in 1955 she was not quite 19. Her husband had been incarcerated for robbery and Mrs. J's stepfather said he could not continue to provide for her and the two children. She had never worked and her mother was not willing to care for the children. Her mother and stepfather rented quarters for her, provided furniture and a television, and assistance was authorized.

In August 1956 an anonymous telephone call was received saying that Mrs. J did not live at the address she had given, but was living with a man in Northeast.

In January 1957 a man was seen in the home. Mrs. J said he was her stepbrother, Mr. C, but when the social worker addressed him as Mr. C, he did not respond. Mrs. J interrupted and introduced him as her cousin and said she had been confused. The young man said he was not Mr. C and was not related to Mrs. J, but was a friend of her brother who had just stopped by because it was a rainy day and he had nothing to do.

Mr. J was paroled and came to the Agency in October 1957. He said he loved Mrs. J and wanted to provide a home for her but

she was not interested because she was living with a Mr. W who had told him to stay away. Mrs. J denied living with a man, or that she was working, as her husband had said. She said Mr. J was good to her and provided well for her prior to his incarceration, "but she just didn't want him anymore." It was explained that assistance could not be continued since Mr. J had offered to provide for his family. Mrs. J said she "would see him put in jail" at which time she would "be back to see us."

In April 1958 Mrs. J reapplied. She said her mother and stepfather had been helping her and that she had no intention of going back to Mr. J. When Mr. J was reached by telephone he said he was out of work and did not want to live with Mrs. J. In May 1958, Mr. J said he was working and was willing to establish a home, but Mrs. J did not want him. He said she had done everything she could to make trouble for him. Mrs. J made it clear that "she felt the children were exclusively hers" and refused to let Mr. J come to see the children. She had not looked for work. A child care plan was arranged by the Agency with another mother who was receiving assistance, and Mrs. J was told that she would not receive assistance after July 31, 1958.

Referral was made to the Investigation Service on May 23, 1958, to determine if the man Mr. J said was living with Mrs. J, or any other man, had free access to the home, or if she has a husband-wife relationship with any man. The Investigation Service was also asked to determine if Mrs. J was or had been employed. On June 3, 1958, Investigation Service reported that Mrs. J was pregnant and that she had been employed under another name.

On June 2, 1958, a neighbor told the agency of Mrs. J's pregnancy, of her running with a fast, rough crowd, drinking heavily and "cursing and cavorting in public."

Mrs. J insisted that Mr. J was responsible for her pregnancy, but he denied this. He said his wife had been pregnant while he was in prison, but that he was not responsible for either that pregnancy or this one. Mr. J's manager was contacted. He said he had seen the man Mrs. J was living with in the home and told of evidences of a "wild party" with couples sleeping in various parts of the house. Mr. J's probation officer said he was in Mrs. J's home in November 1957 and there was a man living with her then. He said "It was apparent to him that Mrs. J was trying to have Mr. J readmitted to prison."

On July 28, 1958, Mrs. J came to the office saying the agency would have to help her now because Mr. J was incarcerated. She was told that she was still ineligible for assistance because she had failed to establish the paternity of her unborn child. Mrs. J saw the District Supervisor, who decided the grant should be continued, with continued efforts to locate the father of her child.

On October 6, 1958, Mrs. J admitted that a Mr. Y, not Mr. J, was responsible for her pregnancy. She said she had withheld this information for fear of jeopardizing her assistance. She said she and Mr. Y were not resuming their relationship. On October 15, 1958, Mr. Y said he never expects to live with Mrs. J again. He said he was ill and was advised to undergo surgery. On October 22, 1958, Mrs. J discussed plans to marry Mr. Y. Since they plan to marry as soon as they obtain divorces, "she felt it would be all right for them to live together as husband and wife." On November 19, 1958, she told I.S. she did not have any intention of seeing Mr. Y again.

The grant continues with the review date set for April 1, 1959.

WHAT ELEMENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR FREQUENT RE-REFERRALS OF CASES TO INVESTIGATION SERVICE ON WHICH WHAT APPEARS TO BE A CONCLUSIVE FINDING HAS BEEN MADE AS A RESULT OF THE ORIGINAL REFERRAL

At a meeting on February 5, 1959, of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Statistician, Chief, Investigation Service, and the Standards Specialist, it was decided that Investigation Service would submit a list of the cases which Investigation Service believed should not have been re-referred.

On February 16, 1959, the Chief of the Investigation Service submitted a list of 8 cases selected from the 127 cases re-referred to Investigation Service by the field staff during July, August and September 1958. Five of these cases were closed and three were active.

Only one case (case B) was among the 49 cases on which part I of the study was based. This case was identified in part I as case No. 20 and was cited to illustrate action taken on information supplied by Investigation Service and community complaints.

These 8 cases were read during the last week in February 1959. They were divided by category as follows:

Aid to dependent children.....	6
Old age assistance.....	1
Aid to the disabled.....	1

A. Findings on case situations and re-referrals:

1. Elements responsible for re-referrals: From a review of the eight cases, it appears that the following elements are responsible for re-referrals:

- (a) Reluctance of staff to make decisions to deny assistance.
- (b) Vehement denial by recipients of relationships.
- (c) Care in weighing information received in relation to source and clients' statements.
- (d) Need for support by I.S. findings before finding client ineligible.
- (e) Conflicting information received.
- (f) Change in worker.

2. Summary of findings:

(a) Investigation Service questioned the re-referrals of only 8 of the 127 cases re-referred in July, August and September 1958.

(b) The study showed that in 6 cases there was enough information in the I.S. reports or in the case records on which to base a decision.

(c) In one case there was sufficient reason for re-referral.

(d) In one case acceptance of the case was questioned, but since this was done, Agency policy required re-referral.

B. Case summaries: See attachment II-1.

ATTACHMENT II-1

CASE A—OAA

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made.

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. C applied in 1956. She had been living with Mr. G, in what appeared to be a common law relationship, but said he could not continue keeping her. In January 1958, after a report was received that Mrs. C had a man and a child living with her, referral was made to I.S. to determine this. On February 5, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. G hiding in a closet, and his grandchild in the home. The janitor confirmed the living arrangements. Mr. G and Mrs. C both denied that he lived there. Calls were received from Mrs. C's landlady, Mr. G's landlady and from the child's mother saying Mr. G and the child were not in Mrs. C's home. In his re-referral to I.S. on Sep-

tember 9, 1958, the worker says he was informed by neighbors that Mr. G had returned home, but Mrs. C said he was in Virginia. On September 15, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. G in bed in Mr. C's home feigning sleep. The case was closed in October 1958.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: It appears that the case was re-referred because information was received from three presumably reliable persons that Mr. G and his grandchild were no longer in the home, after I.S. had found them there, yet neighbors had reported Mr. G had returned. A change in worker may also have had something to do with re-referral.

4. Findings: In view of the conflicting information the worker had received from persons presumed to be reliable, re-referral was justified.

CASE B—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made: Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service to make a decision.

(b) Reason for re-referral is inconsistent with information previously submitted by I.S.

2. Information in case record: This is the case of a 54-year-old woman whose child was born in 1943.

In 1952 she was arrested on a narcotics charge and sentenced to Occoquan. The child was committed to CWD on two occasions. In March 1956 the judge of the juvenile court questioned Miss H's eligibility for continued assistance. A memorandum, dated March 29, 1956, from the Assistant Superintendent to the Deputy Director of Public Welfare describes Miss H as a "pathetic piece of human wreckage * * * who is 'apparently not too bright.'" In 1956 CWD noted report that Miss H had "reverted to the same pattern of living she had at the time of her arrest on the narcotics charge."

Mr. B, father of Miss H's child, was seen in 1948 and in 1957. The record does not indicate any continuing relationship. CWD record indicated he was living with another woman.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral:

On March 19, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B had free access to Miss H's home. I.S. submitted five reports. Many men and also women, were found drinking in the home. The final report dated April 4, 1958 notes that in discussion with the supervisor, "it was decided that I.S. should close its investigation, because of conditions found."

On June 24, 1958, the case was re-referred to I.S. to determine if Mr. B has free access to Miss H's home. In an entry dated June 4, 1958, the record says, "Since I.S. was unable to make a determination on our previous referral because of the living arrangements of the home on L Street, the case is being re-referred to the unit at this time."

In August 1958, I.S. reported numerous visits had been made to the home, that Mr. B had never been seen, but that on all visits except the last, several men had been seen in the apartment. "These men have all shown signs of extreme intoxication, on the other hand there has not been any indication these men were more than friends or acquaintances who had dropped by to visit and drink."

On form No. 122 I.S. noted, "Four men found constantly in home."

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: The elements responsible for re-referral are not clear, since the record showed no indication of a continuing relationship.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified, since there is no indication, either in the

record or in previous I.S. report, of a continuing relationship with Mr. B.

CASE C—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made:

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for the social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record:

Mrs. H applied May 25, 1953. She said she could not continue working because she had no child-care plan. Mr. H deserted in North Carolina in 1951. She came to the District of Columbia in 1952. Her father had helped her. On May 4, 1954, MAD reported that Mrs. H was pregnant. She said Mr. G was responsible for her pregnancy but changed her story and said Mr. W was responsible. She said Mr. W was in Japan. He denied paternity. On October 5, 1954, Mrs. H said she could return to her mother in North Carolina. On April 9, 1956, referral was made to IS to locate Mr. H and Mr. W. In 1956 IS located Mr. H, husband and father of three children in South Carolina. Mrs. H sent him a registered letter but received no reply. No action since 1956 to locate Mr. H except referral to RES in 1958, who found not at 1956 address.

March 1, 1957: Complaint received from a former recipient about people hanging around the house playing cards. She said a man was involved. On June 6, 1957, landlady complained about Mrs. H, saying she should not have help. She said Mr. H had been in town around Christmas time. Mrs. H denied this. On January 20, 1958, IS reported Mr. G found under the porch. On February 6, 1958, IS reported Mr. G in home second time and at the social worker's verbal request IS case was closed. Mrs. H was told she was no longer eligible for assistance. She wanted to talk with the supervisor and a conference was arranged on February 21, 1958, and the case was kept open. She was asked to bring Mr. G to the office which she did on February 24, 1958. He said he was only a casual friend and assumed no responsibility for Mrs. H or her children. On July 8, 1958, another referral was made to IS to determine whether Mr. G lives in the home or whether he or any other man frequents the home. On July 30, 1958, IS reports Mr. G in the home conducting himself like the master of the home. Mrs. H was out and he was caring for the children. The case was closed August 27, 1958, because the man was found living in the home. On October 23, 1958, Mrs. H reapplied. She denied a continuing relationship with Mr. G. Her application was accepted and she was told her case would be assigned to the area worker and that it would be necessary that the area worker interview Mr. G. The record says, "No re-referral was made to FIS due to recent report submitted by FIS re Mr. G." This is contrary to agency policy regarding re-referrals in manual 303.4-3.

No dictation after November 1958.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: After IS had found Mr. G in the home on two occasions, she denied that he frequents her home and said it was just by coincidence he was found there. It was for this reason re-referral was made to determine again whether Mr. G live in the home or whether he or any other man frequents the home.

4. Findings: In view of Mrs. H's unconvincing explanations, it is believed that IS had furnished enough information on which to base a decision.

CASE D—ATD

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made:

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for Social Service to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. H is blind and an alcoholic. Record of arrest and drinking, under several different names, date back to 1933. She has received assistance almost continuously since 1942. Care at DCV suggested in 1942. Child born 1948 was committed to CWD because Mrs. H was not capable of providing care. On almost every page of the record there is a change of address. On April 23, 1956, two men were seen in the home. On December 15, 1956, report received that Mrs. H was living with a man. On January 7, 1957 referral was made to I.S. to determine whether a man lives in the home. January 16, 1957 I.S. reports three men found in home and February 11, 1957 two men found. On February 18, 1957 worker found two men in home. Mrs. H admitted having lived with Mr. D for 7 or 8 years. Mr. D was found eligible for assistance until his death April 3, 1958. On June 4, 1958 worker found a man in Mrs. H's room, and told her the grant could not continue "unless she moved to a room and board arrangement because she appears to be an easy victim for worthless men to take advantage of her." Room and board arrangements were made by worker with a Mrs. W, who telephoned June 5, 1958 to say she could not allow Mrs. H to remain because she had too many men friends visiting her. Goodwill Industries had also reported men frequenting the home. August 1, 1958 check canceled because Mrs. H's whereabouts were unknown. On September 17, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether there was a man living in the home or having free access. On September 22, 1958, I.S. reported finding two men. They and Mrs. H were drunk. The landlady said one of the men was always there. A large quantity of food was found. The case was closed in September.

3. Elements responsible for referral: The man I.S. found to be living with Mrs. D in 1957 died in April 1958. This may have been why the case was re-referred. The worker may have referred to substantiate reports received in June 1958 of frequent male visitors, although she herself had found a man in the home.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified since the worker had obtained enough information on which to base a decision.

CASE E—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made:

Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record.

2. Information in case record: Miss K. has received assistance continuously since 1952 when the grant was made on a "temporary" basis. She lived with her family, rent free, until 1955 when she moved to NOHA. Reports concerning Miss K's behavior have come to the Agency since August 1953. The first report of her relationship with Mr. S. was received in May 1956. In August they both said the relationship was being discontinued so that the grant would continue. In November 1956, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether or not Mr. S. or any man was in or visiting the home and to locate Mr. B., father of Miss K's two oldest children. I.S. located Mr. B. and found Mr. S. in the home. The record is 62 pages in length, composed for the most part of reports concerning Miss K's behavior, her

denials, and page after page of Agency explanation of policy in relation to continued absence. No action was taken and no referral made. Numerous reports were received from the NCHA Manager who reported from time to time that Mr. S. was living in the home. For example, on July 23, 1957, I.S. reported that the manager of Stanton Dwellings said he had "positive information" that Miss K. is being supported by Mr. S. The manager also said that Miss K. was writing numbers and that several "persons in the neighborhood act as lookout for Miss K." so that Miss K. can be warned to "clear house." This warning service also extends through the entire Stanton Dwelling area for the benefit of other recipients. Miss K. told NCHA whatever she did was her business. On page 56 of the case record (undated), there were reports of illegal activities, writing numbers, sale of liquor, "large parties" and that Mr. S. was in the home. The worker points out that "the reports were not conclusive enough to warrant withholding of assistance." On September 9, 1957, NCHA again reported that Miss K. has a paramour. Both Miss K. and Mr. S. again denied any continuing relationship. In spite of Agency policy that complaints are to be referred immediately to I.S., more than 10 months elapsed until May 7, 1958, when the case was again referred to I.S. to establish whether Miss K. has resources from illegal activities and whether Mr. S. or any man was residing in the home. On May 15, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S.'s car parked in front of the home. On June 30, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S. found in the home. On July 29, 1958, I.S. reported Mr. S. in the home on June 30 and July 28, 1958. On August 26 the case was closed because of Miss K.'s continued relationship with Mr. S. Form No. 11, notice of discontinuance, also notes that Mr. S. and Miss K. were married.

3. Elements responsible for referral: The elements responsible for referral were not clear since there appeared to be ample evidence in the record and from I.S. reports that Miss K. was continuing her relationship with Mr. S.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified. Reports concerning Miss K.'s ineligibility came to the agency as early as 1953 and have continued. Miss K. seems to have been clearly ineligible for assistance at least since 1956.

CASE F—ADC

1. Investigation service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made. Investigation service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service to make a decision.

(b) Application should not have been accepted since landlord is paramour and case was closed previously due to I.S. finding him in home.

2. Information in case record: In old protective service record of Miss S's mother, Miss S. is described by her teacher as "a well-behaved child who is unable to learn anything at school." A note in the case record, dated January 26, 1959, says her I.Q. is 53. Miss S. applied in 1954 because her paramour and the father of her three youngest children had died. Received assistance and continued to live with mother, with whom she had always lived. In 1957 Mr. B. was found in home by I.S. Miss S. said he was her uncle. Said she wanted to move from her mother's home. She was told there was no objection to this. The case was closed in March 1958 because Mr. S. and Mr. W. had access to the home. It was noted that Miss S. describes all men found in her home as "uncles."

3. Elements responsible for referral: Miss S. reapplied again in June 1958 and after

conference with the supervisor, referral was made to I.S. July 17, 1958, to determine whether Mr. S. had access and Miss S.'s relationship to him. The referral noted that the apartment was rented in Mr. S.'s name. On August 26, 1958, I.S. reported the apartment was rented in Mr. S.'s name, that he was still paying the rent and terminated the investigation because of the continued access of Mr. S. On August 12, 1958, before I.S. report was received, the application was prepared for termination. However, on August 22, 1958, Miss S. and Mr. S. were in the office. He denied any relationship to Miss S. On September 17, 1958, the case was again submitted for termination, but in supervisory conference September 29, 1958, it was decided to ask Miss S. and Mr. S. to come to the office again. There were two failed appointments and the application was finally terminated due to loss of contact.

At the time of Miss S.'s last application, December 17, 1958, she again said the house was rented in the name of an uncle.

4. Findings: Since case was accepted, re-referral was justified on basis of policy covering cases to be referred. However, acceptance of the application is seriously questioned.

CASE G—ADC

1. Investigation service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made. Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because: I.S. had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

2. Information in case record: Mrs. S. applied for assistance in February 1956. She had three children and was pregnant. She said Mr. S. had deserted, that he was a poor provider and drank. On May 22, 1956, the Woman's Bureau's record was read. Mr. S. reported that Mrs. S. had left him periodically and that on several occasions he had found her in bed with a man at the Dunbar Hotel. He asked the Woman's Bureau to take the children. The last recorded Woman's Bureau contact was in October 1955 when both Mr. and Mrs. S. were found at home watching television and Mrs. S. said she had returned and decided not to separate from her husband. In June 1956, the application was terminated because continued absence was not established. Mrs. S. reapplied in November 1956. In January 1957, referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. S. In October 1957, I.S. reported they had located Mr. S. in Baltimore. A letter was written to him and returned marked "Unknown." In December 1957, a careful explanation of Agency policy is recorded. Mrs. S. said she was not participating in such a relationship. On July 29, 1958, referral was made to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. S. was participating in a relationship with any man. It was pointed out in the referral that on a recent visit a man was seen who was introduced as a cousin. On August 11, 1958, I.S. reported Mrs. S. unclad in an unlighted living room with a man she identified as John L., who ran out the back door. On August 21, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S. had said the man found in the home was not John L. but Ralph H. Mrs. S. was pregnant and said that the father of her new baby was Mr. L. Mrs. S. and the man seen at the time of the previous visit were engaging in sexual intercourse at time of I.S. visit. On August 19, 1958, pregnancy was discussed. She said a close relationship had existed for 6 or 7 months prior to Mr. L.'s disappearance about 2 months ago. On August 21, 1958, Mrs. S. said she could not obtain any information about Mr. L. or Mr. H. She "was advised that the information which she had provided the Agency is not logical and is definitely insufficient grounds for continuing assistance to her and the children." "The client was advised if

she is willing a request would be made to our I.S. regarding locating Mr. L. She was told that this would be a 'rush referral' and that assistance would continue to be suspended pending the report. At first Mrs. S. did not reply as to whether she was willing or not for this investigation, but said that she does not feel that it is necessary for the investigators to again come snooping around her house when there is nothing to find." On August 29 a re-referral was submitted to I.S. to determine whether Mrs. S. is participating in a family relationship with any man and to locate Mr. L. On September 4, 1958, Mr. S. called to know why she had not received her check. It was explained that she would need to bring the father of her expected child to the office and she replied she did not intend to do this. She said it was OK to close the case. On September 22, 1958, I.S. reported that Mrs. S. had refused to admit them because she said her case was closed for failure to bring in the man discovered leaving her apartment on August 7, 1958. On October 6, 1958, the case was closed because continued absence was not established.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: It appears from the case record re-referral was made because of Mrs. S.'s vehement denial in the interview of August 21, 1958.

4. Findings: Re-referral was not justified because I.S. had furnished enough information to justify a decision of ineligibility.

CASE H—ADC

1. Investigation Service reason for believing re-referral should not have been made. Investigation Service believed this case should not have been re-referred because:

(a) Investigation Service had furnished enough information on original investigation for social service staff to make a decision.

(b) Information in case record: 2. Information in case record: When Miss T. applied in May 1957 she was employed as a nurse's aid at Doctor's Hospital but said she had no child care plan. She said she lived with Mr. J., father of the two children who were with her, from 1952 until 1954 and irregularly until June 1956. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. J. On February 19, 1958, I.S. reported they had located Mr. J. in Miami. Miss T. was referred to RES but the case could not be accepted because paternity had not been adjudicated or established under oath. In March 1958 a report was received from the resident manager of the apartment that Mr. P. stays at Miss T.'s apartment nights at a time and helps her to buy expensive food. She said Mr. P. and another male tenant have dinner with Miss T. every evening; that Miss T. is cruel to her children and is not a fit mother. On March 28, a referral was made to I.S. to determine Miss T.'s relationship with Mr. P., whether she has boarders and whether she is employed. On April 23, 1958, I.S. reported finding Mr. P. in Miss T.'s apartment. Miss T. said he was her girl friend's husband but he told I.S. later he did not know why she had said this. On May 13, 1958, I.S. reported finding Miss T. in Mr. P.'s apartment.

On May 8, 1958, the I.S. report was discussed with Miss T., who denied any relationship whatsoever with Mr. P. On May 13, 1958, Mr. P. telephoned. He also denied any relationship. The record says, "I let him know that assistance would be withheld for Miss T. until he did come in to talk with us." Mr. P. said he did not care whether or not Miss T. received assistance and he did not come to the office. On May 27, 1958, it was decided in supervisory conference that the I.S. report did not contain sufficient evidence for a family relationship between Miss T. and Mr. P. Assistance was continued. On June 17, 1958, further reports were received from the resident manager, whose attitude showed considerable malice toward Miss T.

On July 30, 1958, reports were received from another individual that Miss T. had been visiting in the apartment of Mr. P. for the past three nights and that since Miss T. had moved she has been to Mr. P.'s apartment every weekend. She said she is cooking for Mr. P. and does not need assistance because Mr. P. is taking care of her. On August 18, 1958, re-referral was made to I.S. to ascertain if a family relationship existed with Mr. P. On September 16, 1958, Miss T. telephoned to say she is going to work at Doctor's Hospital. "She was quite upset and said she could not continue to live as she had been and be haunted and live like a hermit, not being able to have visitors and being followed wherever she goes. * * * She said Mr. P. is her boyfriend and she has been going with him 2 or 3 months. * * *"

On September 26, 1958, I.S. reported finding Miss T. in Mr. P.'s apartment. The case was closed November 19, 1958, because Miss T. was employed.

3. Elements responsible for re-referral: The element responsible for re-referral seems to have been the decision at supervisory conference that the I.S. report did not contain sufficient evidence of a family relationship. The animosity of the resident manager toward Miss T. may also have been a factor. However, prior to the re-referral on August 18, 1958, an additional report had been received.

4. Findings: A re-referral was not justified on the basis of I.S. reports and other information in the case record.

PART III. WHAT ELEMENTS ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE WIDE VARIATION IN THE NUMBER OF REFERRALS BETWEEN SOCIAL WORKERS OR BETWEEN UNITS?

At a meeting on March 2, 1959, with the superintendent, assistant superintendent, statistician, chief, investigation service, and the standards specialist, it was decided that part III would be developed by a study of two caseloads: the one carried by the worker making the fewest number of referrals to investigation service and the caseload carried by the worker making the largest number of referrals to investigation service, during the period October 1955 through September 1958. These caseloads were No. 152 and No. 223 respectively.

It was decided that a schedule would not be developed for reading these cases. Instead, a chart would be used showing, for the "minimum" caseload, the cases which should have been referred and the reason and date referral should have been made. For the "maximum" caseload the chart would show the reason referrals were made and dates.

The reading was to begin with the caseload No. 152. The assistant superintendent explained to the district supervisor, the supervisor and the worker that the cases would be read and the purpose of the reading.

On March 3, 1959, the chief, registration and files, prepared a list of cases in caseload No. 152 as of February 28, 1959. A copy of this list was sent to the chief of investigation service, who prepared a list of cases referred to I.S. and the action taken.

A. Caseload of social worker making fewest referrals to I.S.

1. Summary of findings:

(a) Cases read: Seventy-four cases from a caseload of 124 were read.

In 40, or 54.1 percent of the 74 cases referred to I.S. by this social worker was not indicated. Fifteen of these forty cases had been referred previously, two by the present worker, and thirteen by intake or by the previous worker. Twenty-five had not been referred.

In approximately 24 cases, referral was not indicated because of the case situation. In most of these situations there was no ques-

tion of access as the children were living in the home of a relative other than the parent, or both parents were living in the home. In the other 16 cases, referral was not indicated for a number of reasons. In two cases, the worker initiated action. In the other 14, action on the basis of information already at hand rather than referral to I.S. was indicated, or the action indicated was not referral or re-referral, but the closing of the case. See case illustrations, attachment A.

In 32 cases, or 43.2 percent, of the 74, referral or re-referral to I.S. should have been made, as each case record included information that should have been followed up or clarified to eliminate any question of eligibility. Of these 32 cases, 14 had never been referred to I.S.; 18 had been referred previously but should have been re-referred.

In two cases, case No. 1 and case No. 59, there was not enough information in the record on which the reviewer could base a decision, as to whether or not there should have been referral to I.S. In both of these cases the father was incarcerated when application was made. The records were read several months after the sentences were to have been completed. The records did not show what had happened in relation to the fathers since their release.

(b) Cases which should have been referred:

Of the 32 cases which should have been referred, referral should have been made for the following reasons listed in the manual, part III-303.4—Cases to be referred.

Reason cases should have been referred to I.S. and number of cases

Cases in which there is reason to believe that client is not eligible for assistance or that there are factors in the case affecting eligibility which cannot be proved by the social worker..... 5

A person who reapplies for public assistance whose case had previously been closed and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources. This type of case should be marked "rush"..... 4

Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing; any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location will benefit PAD..... 7

Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved is present in the home or has free access to the home, if the social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to presence or absence..... 8

Any complaint or denunciation—anonymous or otherwise—of a man living in, or having free access to, the home of a recipient..... 1

Any complaint or denunciation concerning other factors of eligibility after the social worker has been unable to prove or disprove the assertion and feels Investigation Service can provide the proof more expeditiously..... 1

All cases except OAA and AB in which the recipient shares the rent of a home or an apartment with another family, who are not relatives or recipients, and has lived with the same family at a previous address..... 1

Combination of reasons..... 5

Total..... 32

(c) Elements responsible for failure to refer to Investigation Service.

From the reading of 74 cases in this caseload it appears that the following ele-

ments are responsible for failure to refer to Investigation Service:

(1) Failure to carry out Agency policies in relation to the eligibility requirements:

(a) Acceptance of client's statements without verification.

(b) Too ready assumption by Agency of support of children when this support should be carried by parents.

(1) Husband or other men located by Investigation Service or address known but not seen nor appropriate action taken: In 13 cases the address of the husband or father was known, but appropriate action was not taken. In a number of instances the husband or father had been seen when assistance was granted previously, and the case may have been closed because absence was not established. When the most recent application was made, no effort was made to communicate with him. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(2) No effort made by mother to locate husband or fathers: In approximately 18 cases, no effort was made by the mother to locate the husband or father, although she may have been held to this requirement when previous applications were made. See case illustration, attachment A.

(3) Child care plan seems to be available: In approximately 13 cases a child care plan seemed to be available. These cases included only those where the mother had work experience, and had made arrangements for care of the children in the past, where several relatives were receiving ADC, and it would appear reasonable to expect that at least one mother could work, or those where other relatives were living reasonably close to the mother. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(c) Failure to carry out agency policies in relation to continued absence.

(d) Too much emphasis on establishing a placid and reassuring relationship with the client and too little emphasis on eligibility factors in spite of repeated evidence of falsification and deception.

Eligibility not clearly established: In approximately 22 cases, eligibility did not appear to be clearly established. In nearly all instances this finding was related to c-1-(b) above. For example, in case No. 4, Mrs. D's statements that her husband was absent were found on two previous occasions to be untrue and the case closed, yet when she applied again, assistance was authorized, and the grant continues with no effort to talk with him or to learn the true facts. See case illustrations, attachment A.

(e) No action taken on cases transferred into the caseload until a review is due.

Inadequate agency controls to assure that the agency knows what is happening and what is not happening in cases and that policies are understood and carried out.

2. Description of area: The worker has carried her caseload in essentially the same area since June 1956. The area is composed of census tracts 49-B and 52-A. It includes the odd side of Massachusetts Avenue NW, to the even side of S Street NW, and from 10th to 16th Street NW. Most of the clients live between 10th and 12th and between M and P Streets NW. The houses in this area were described by the worker as being very old, rat and vermin infested. The houses are for the most part three stories, cut up into apartments. Some floors are made into two apartments so that, including the basement, houses in which one family used to live now house eight families. Some are used as rooming houses, housing eight roomers. The worker estimated that 99 percent of the clients in her area are Negro. Although the worker has carried cases in this area since June 1956, the boundaries of the area have changed somewhat to adjust the caseload with that of the worker in the adjoining area

carrying caseload No. 151. This has resulted in the transfer of cases between these two workers.

3. Basis for decisions as to referral:

It was not always possible to determine when a case was transferred to the present worker. The date of the first recorded entry was usually used to determine this date. When there was no recording by the present worker, but other documents were in the record, the dates on these were used. For example, in one case there was no recorded entry, but there was a memorandum dated December 16, 1958, addressed to the worker by R & F. That date was used.

In deciding whether or not referral to I.S. was indicated, continuous reference was made by the reviewer to Agency policy explaining situations which are to be referred. This policy is in section 111-303.4 of the Agency Manual and is included in part I of this study.

The reviewer's decision in each case was made on the basis of information found in the case record.

The decision by the reviewer as to whether or not referral should be made to I.S. was not an easy one. In some instances there is not enough information in the record on which to base a decision.

In others the recording was not up to date.

The status of the recording by the present worker was as follows:

Date of last recorded entry and number of cases

1957.....	5
January-June 1958.....	16
July-December 1958.....	24
1959.....	14
No entry by present worker.....	14
Undetermined.....	1

Total..... 74

In most cases referral to I.S. and the reason for referral are recorded. In most cases, too, reports from I.S. and the action taken as a result of the information furnished are also recorded. In a few cases, however, there is no entry concerning referral or I.S. reports, nor of action taken, although the case was referred and I.S. reports were in the record.

Another factor which made the reviewer's decision as to referral difficult was the method of recording. The forms used for recording and the narrative were not complete or up to date, or missing. Information for the study was found for the most part in narrative recording which is now filed in "Retired" records.

B. Caseload of social worker making greatest number of referrals to Investigation Service.

1. Summary of findings:

(a) Cases read:

Forty-one cases from a caseload of 165 were read. Ten, or 24.4 percent of the 41 cases had been referred to Investigation Service by the social worker responsible for the caseload. Of these 10 cases, only 1 had been previously referred. Of the 41 cases, 15 had been referred by previous workers. In 9 of the 10 cases referred, the review showed that the referral was justified on the basis of Agency policy. One referral was made which should not have been made. See case illustrations, attachment B.

In seven cases, referral should have been made and was not made, because each of the case records included information that should have been followed up or clarified. Of these seven cases, two had been referred by the previous workers and should have been re-referred and two were referred by the subsequent workers. See case illustrations, attachment B.

(b) Cases referred to Investigation Service: The 10 cases were referred for the fol-

lowing reasons listed in the manual, part III-303.4, cases to be referred.

Report on number of cases:

Clarification of resources, such as bank accounts, civil service and other types of retirement, veterans' benefits, etc... 3
Reapplication by a person whose case had been closed previously and assistance terminated due to misrepresentation or fraud by the applicant, location of husband or other man in the home, or concealed resources..... 1

Any ADC case in which the client claims that a mother, husband, or father of her or his child or children included in the grant is missing; any case in which a relative or spouse is missing whose location would benefit PAD..... 1
Any case in which the social worker has reasonable suspicion that the man involved is present in the home or has free access to the home, if a social worker has been unable to obtain sufficient evidence to arrive at a reasonable conclusion as to presence or absence... 2
Combination of reasons..... 3

Total..... 10

(c) Cases which should have been re-referred: The seven cases where the review showed a referral should have been made were carried only briefly by the worker whose caseload is under study and who carried more than twice the normal number of cases. One case was carried by the worker from June 1958 to February 1959, and one from November 1958 to February 1959. In five of the cases, the length of time carried could not be determined.

(d) Other findings: As the cases were read, the following additional findings were made.

(1) Husband or other man located by I. S. or address known but not seen nor appropriate action taken: In approximately seven cases the address of the husband or father was known, but appropriate action was not taken.

(2) No effort made by mother to locate husband or fathers: In approximately four cases, no effort was made by the mother to locate the husband or father, although she may have been held to this requirement when previous applications were made.

(3) Child care plan seems to be available: In approximately nine cases a child care plan seemed to be available. These cases included only those where the mother had work experience, and had made arrangements for care of the children in the past or those where other relatives were living reasonably close to the mother.

(4) Eligibility not clearly established: In approximately eight cases, eligibility did not appear to be clearly established. In nearly all instances this finding was related to (1), (2), and (3) above.

2. Description of area and caseload: The cases in this caseload are located in census tracts 73, 74.3, and 74.4. The area is at the southern tip of the District, for the most part east of South Capitol Street. It includes the area north of D.C. Village and around Bolling Field and St. Elizabeth's Hospital, over to the Maryland line. This is a large and diversified area including private homes, apartments, and four NCHA dwellings. The residents of the area are for the most part white, with the exception of two NCHA dwellings. Twenty-nine or 70.7 percent live in NCHA dwellings.

The worker carried the caseload in this area for about 5 years until February 1959. However, in 17 of the records read there was no recording by this worker. It appears that in late 1958, a large number of cases were transferred into this caseload and the worker had no contact with the clients by the time he left the caseload in February 1959. The

length of time the cases read were carried by this worker was as follows:

4 years.....	1
3 years.....	1
2 years.....	6
9 months.....	1
8 months.....	1
7 months.....	1
6 months.....	2
5 months.....	5
4 months.....	2
3 months.....	2
2 months.....	1
Less than 1 month.....	1
Undetermined (recent transfer).....	17

Total..... 41

Whenever possible the date of the first recorded entry was used to determine when the case was transferred into the caseload. Even when there was an entry in the case record it was not always possible to determine when the case was received by the worker. For example, in one case there was only a one-line entry by the worker dated October 1, 1958 which read as follows: "Review completed on form 55. For budget computation, see form 58." The form 55 was unsigned and undated. The authorization on form 58 by the worker, effective from July 1, 1958, to September 30, 1958, was signed but undated. In this instance, the date of July 1958 was used as the date the worker became responsible for the case.

With four exceptions, the dictation on the cases read was up to date, entries having been made by the workers to whom the cases were assigned after February 1959.

(c) Elements responsible for variation in the number of cases referred to I.S.:

From the review of cases in the two caseloads, it appears that the basic element responsible for the wide variation in the number of cases referred to I.S. is the wide variation in the understanding, acceptance, and use of agency policy.

The worker making the highest number of referrals (caseload 223) should actually have referred 17.3 percent more of the cases read, but was prevented from doing so by the fact that the cases were assigned to him for such a brief period of time. Of the cases he did refer to I.S., only one case was found where an unnecessary referral was made when conclusive evidence for action was available without referral.

The worker making the fewest number of referrals (caseload 152) should have referred 43.2 percent more of the cases read.

The decision to refer or not to refer seems to have been made on the basis of the judgment of the individual worker, rather than on the basis of policy established by the Agency.

Although the worker carrying caseload No. 152 had been responsible for her caseload since June 1956 and the worker carrying caseload No. 223 had been responsible for his caseload 2½ years, some of the cases read were carried by these workers for only brief periods. For details as to length of time cases were carried by present workers see attachment C.

In caseload No. 152 there were 14 cases with no recording by the worker, and in caseload No. 223 there were 17 such cases. The records read were, for the most part, also carried by other workers in the Agency. These records showed that the effect of lack of consistency in the use of Agency policy extends beyond the two workers whose caseloads were reviewed and beyond referral or failure to refer to Investigation Service.

In the cases read, there was evidence that the eligibility requirements and the responsibilities to which clients were held and the granting or denial of assistance depended upon the worker to whom the case was assigned. The concept of the worker as a representative of the Agency, in contrast to

the worker as an individual, is not clear to staff.

Another element responsible for the variation in the number of cases referred to Investigation Service is the lack of controls established by the Agency to assure that policies are understood and followed by each worker. Under present policy, the supervisor is in no way involved in referrals to Investigation Service.

It is hoped that one of the values of the administrative case review to be undertaken by the Agency in September 1959 will be to determine the validity of actions taken by the staff. In the last analysis, it is always the worker and the worker alone who either expresses or defeats the intent of the Agency.

ATTACHMENT A—CASE ILLUSTRATIONS
CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT
CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 24: Miss G, age 18, applied for assistance February 26, 1956 having been referred by Family and Child Services. She said she did not get along with her mother who complained that Miss G sees the mother's boyfriend when the mother is away. Miss G said she wanted to demonstrate she could care for her children. The father of the oldest child lives with his family at an address given by Miss G. He contributed \$15 every 2 weeks. The father of the second child is at Fort Belvoir. On May 23, 1956, Miss G's probation officer told of her conviction for assault. She has a juvenile court record for housebreaking, shoplifting, disorderly conduct, and assault. She was also known to the woman's bureau through prostitution and committed to B.P. She was given a mental evaluation and was found not to be psychotic—"just unable to take care of herself—has many ways of a girl about 4 years old, is considered promiscuous." It was said she regards her children as a child would a doll. When she gets tired of them she wants to throw them away. It was felt that the mother and grandmother, not Miss G, should be responsible for the two children. An entry, dated July 2, 1956, says "the Agency did not plan to approve assistance because Miss G had not met all requirements in having the fathers of the children come to the office." The application was terminated because absence was not established. On January 28, 1958, referral was made by CWD. Shirley was placed in Junior Village because Miss G had beaten her with an electric light cord. The neighbors had called the police. CWD referral said Miss G had expressed a desire to establish a home of her own if eligible for assistance. The mother and grandmother have been helping. On February 24, 1958, the Woman's Bureau said they had known Miss G since 1948. Since 1954 there had been frequent reports about the neglect of the children. On April 2, 1958, information was received that Miss G was pregnant. The father was given as Mr. C. In the CWD referral Mr. C was said to be the father of Miss G's second child and his address is unknown. Assistance has continued to Miss G in spite of the report from the probation officer in May 1956, without referral to I.S. to determine access, and without any effort on Miss G's part to locate the fathers. There was no record of the Woman's Bureau or the CWD records having been read or of any interview with the mother or grandmother, although Miss G was told at the time of her application in 1956 that this would have to be done.

ACTION BY WORKER SEEMS INDICATED RATHER
THAN RE-REFERRAL TO I.S. ELIGIBILITY NOT
CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 48: Mrs. M's first application for assistance was in November 1951 for herself and 4 children. She said Mr. M had deserted in July and that his sister has helped her. In June 1952, Mr. M was to pay \$15.00 a week

through J.C. On April 13, 1953, Mr. M called. He had arranged with Mrs. M. to take two of the children to enable her to go to work. He was to assist with the care of the two children remaining with her. "When he went to get the children she raved and said she was not going to work as long as she could get a check and his help too." On November 17, 1953 it was learned that Mrs. M was pregnant. She said William G was the father of the child born November 20, 1953. On November 30, 1953, Mr. G was seen in the home. They planned to continue their relationship. Mrs. M and the baby were not included in the code. In 1954 Mr. M went into the service, made an allotment to his family and the case was closed. On September 27, 1955 Mrs. M reapplied. She said her husband had been discharged from the service and the allotment ceased. Her relationship with Mr. G continues and the application was terminated because absence was not established. She reapplied November 30, 1955. Another baby by Mr. G was born in January 1955. This application was also terminated because absence was not established. She has received assistance continuously since her last application in January 1956. She wanted CWD to place two of the boys and this was done. On February 15, 1956, Mr. G in the office in response to a letter. He said he had had no contact with Mrs. M since last fall. He gave his address, the name of his employer and signed an agreement to pay \$5.00 a week. On February 16, 1956 Mrs. M was told she must try to locate her husband before assistance could be given. She said she could not locate him. However, on March 7, 1956, he came to the office. He gave his address and his employer. He said he had been employed at the same place since 1951. He would like his sister to have the two boys since Mrs. M. is not able to give proper care and supervision. In 1955 he filed for a divorce on the grounds of adultery. He said he intended to seek custody of all the children. He has no interest in Mrs. M and said Mr. G broke up his home. On March 12, 1956 CWD expressed the opinion that Mrs. M should have the children. On March 16, 1956 Mr. M's sister was seen. The girls are living with her and she would also take the boys. When the girls first came to her, they were quite vulgar and talked about things they had seen their mother do. The girls said their mother slept with Mr. G and they slept on the floor. She said the girls refused to visit their mother overnight. She said the boys need not have been placed by CWD as she would have taken them. She mentioned a sister in South Carolina who would be glad to have the boys with her. The worker recorded she was impressed with Mrs. E, Mr. M's sister. In March 1956 the boys were in Mrs. E's home, placement having been arranged by CWD. Temporary assistance was authorized for Mrs. M and the baby until she could get work, the worker to follow the case closely regarding employment. In May Mrs. M said she could not seek employment because her child was ill. In March 1957 the record says assistance was granted on a temporary basis because of the verified illness of the child. On August 3, 1957 Mrs. M was arrested for larceny. She was released after 30 days, although this was her second offense. Assistance continued on a temporary basis. On January 10, 1958 it was learned that a female child had been born on December 19, 1957. William H was named as the father. On January 24, 1958 referral was made to I.S. to determine the access of Mr. M. On January 28, 1958 Mr. M was found by I.S. in the home and was found not to be living at the address given. On February 4, 1958 Mrs. M denied that Mr. M lived in her home and said the relationship had been discontinued. On February 19, 1958 Mr. M was in the office. He "seemed sincere." He said Mrs. M used to visit him in his apartment but that the relationship had ended.

The entry on Form No. 22, dated March 27, 1958 says Mr. G and Mrs. M "claim their relationship was a casual one" and that "referral is being made again to verify this * * *". No re-referral was made, and the grant continues.

REFERRAL NOT INDICATED ACTION SHOULD BE
TAKEN BY WORKER—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 63: Mrs. S, age 18, applied for assistance September 17, 1958, because of her pregnancy. She said she came to the District in 1957 from North Carolina, because she was not getting along with her husband. She said she had received help from an uncle and aunt and from her boyfriend, Joseph T, from whom she had "broken" off. In an entry on form No. 246, Mrs. S said her husband had never contributed toward her support. She has two other children supported by his parents in North Carolina. She had lived with a Mr. T from April to August 1958 when she left him because he became abusive because of information given by his sister that Mrs. S was having "other affairs and accepting money from other men." She denied this. She said she was an "A" student in North Carolina and left school at 14 to marry because she was pregnant. Emergency assistance was authorized and the grant has continued. There is no discussion recorded as to who is the father of her coming baby. There is no record of any discussion with the aunt and uncle with whom Mrs. S is living. Form No. 258 says Mrs. S is living with her aunt rent free. However, Payroll Control says the grant is \$109, which seems to include shelter. Support was taken over by the Agency without question, with no investigation and no communication with the husband or father of the expected child.

CASE SHOULD NOT BE REFERRED—ACTION
SHOULD BE TAKEN BY WORKER

Case No. 60: Mrs. S applied for assistance December 20, 1957. She said Mr. S is under court order to pay \$22 a week. Form No. 258, "Living Arrangements," says the apartment is rented in the name of a friend, David L, who works at the Sanitation Department. There is no recorded information concerning Mrs. S's separation from her husband and no request that he be interviewed, although his address is known.

ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—
REFERRAL NOT INDICATED

Case No. 31: Miss H applied October 12, 1950, saying she had one child and was pregnant by Mr. S. She has been working and has never taken Mr. S to court. He came to the office with Miss H and agreed to give \$20 a month. In January 1962 Miss H called to say that she was working and asked that her case be closed. She reapplied May 8, 1958, saying that she was ill and could not continue employment. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. S but no report has been received from I.S. A medical report dated May 12, 1958, gives Miss H's prognosis as "good." Entry on form No. 246 says Miss H will continue to work 3 days a week. There is no current medical information.

ACTION INDICATED BY SOCIAL WORKER RATHER
THAN RE-REFERRAL TO I.S. ELIGIBILITY NOT
CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 8: When Miss C applied for assistance in 1947 she was 17 years old and had two children. Since 1947 Miss C. has had six additional children. When a home visit was made on January 3, 1952, a 14-year-old cousin appeared to be part of the family. This child was pregnant by Mr. Harry E., who is the brother of Blondell E., the father of one of Miss C's children. In May 1952 a report was received concerning a 16-year-old girl with two children living with Miss C. The report also revealed that Miss C. and the 16-year-old girl are both pregnant. The father of Miss C's expected child was given as Clarence J. Mr. J was seen on a number

of occasions but his continuing relationship with Miss C was not discussed or at least not recorded. He said he had three other children born out of wedlock and contributes toward their support. On April 6, 1955, another ADC client reported that her daughter had moved out of her home and had gone to live with Miss C.

When this was discussed with Miss C, she said the girl was no longer in her home. She said the girl goes with her brother, Clyde C. In an undated entry on page 41, a young man ran out of the home when the worker visited. Miss C identified him as Nathaniel M, her boy friend, and said she had been keeping company with him for about 5 months. She said he gave her approximately \$25 a month. This was later verified by talking with Mr. M. Both admitted their intimate relationship. She said she usually goes to Mr. M's house, leaving the children with a neighbor's daughter. On September 7, 1955, worker told Miss C that no further assistance could be authorized until the purchase of a television could be cleared. She had said previously that her brother had bought the set for her, paying \$99 cash for it. On October 3, 1955, it was verified that Miss C's brother had purchased the television set for \$299. On October 10, 1955, Miss C said Mr. M had been helping her. She said she had been seeing him about four times a week. She thinks this relationship should not affect her eligibility for assistance. She was told that "we would have to consider her case in every detail before we could make a decision as to her continued eligibility for assistance." It appeared she was not eligible for assistance.

On October 14, 1955, another ADC recipient told of staying temporarily in Miss C's home and that her brother Clyde and his girl friend were also there. Miss C denied this but later admitted they were there. On October 20, 1955, the NCHA project manager called. Miss C had told him that her uncle and his wife from North Carolina were visiting her. The worker remarks in the record: "It seems as if Miss C finds it as difficult to tell other people the truth as much as she does us." On January 19, 1956, referral was made to I.S. to establish where Mr. M is actually living. I.S. reported that Mr. M lives with his brother. Mr. M admitted that he is still Miss C's boy friend. On February 20, 1956, Miss C said Mr. M was very much interested in marrying her. She said she "could not make up her mind as to whether she wanted to continue to receive public assistance for the children or depend upon Mr. M for the support of them. I told her that it seemed as if she would prefer to have her independence and choose to be supported by a husband rather than by an agency. She agreed with me but said that as long as she had received assistance she had gotten used to the idea and thought of it as something on which she could depend." The case was closed March 1956. On October 23, 1957, Miss C reapplied. Reference is made to form No. 25 for details but this form was not found in the record. When the worker talked with Miss C about her relationship with Mr. M she hesitated before answering. "In the meantime Patricia said that Mr. M has been to visit and he used to live with them at the present apartment. Miss C told Patricia to close her mouth because I was talking to her."

Miss C then told me that Mr. M had been to visit but did not remain overnight. She said she was not going to let him live in her home again. Referral had been made to I.S. by Intake on October 24, 1957, to establish whether Mr. M was living in or frequenting the home. On November 27, 1957, I.S. reported not finding Mr. M. On one of the three visits, Miss C had gone to a movie. On December 23, 1957, I.S. reported Miss C was not at home when a visit was made on December 13, 1957, at 10 p.m. On November 19, 1957, it was decided that since Mr. M

was not found in the home assistance would be authorized. The references in the record to I.S. reports indicate only that Mr. M was not found there. There is no mention of Miss C's absences from the home. The last entry in the record dated November 21, 1958, says that Miss C has told the worker she has given up her relationship with Mr. M and the Agency's policy was emphasized again.

At the time of Miss C's last application for assistance, no mention is made of her youngest child, Nathaniel, born August 2, 1956, except that his name appears on the form No. 108 and he is mentioned in the October 24, 1957, referral to I.S. In an entry dated October 1, 1958, Miss C said she was keeping four of her brother's children. Miss C's situation when her application was accepted in October 1957 seemed no different from the situation when her case was closed in 1956. The three reports concerning the young pregnant girls in Miss C's home were apparently unquestioned and no referral was made to the Woman's Bureau to see what was going on in this home. Assistance was authorized and has continued without any effort to communicate with Mr. M.

REFERRAL NOT INDICATED—MOTHER SEEMS TO BE EMPLOYABLE—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 32: Mrs. H has made seven applications and has received assistance continuously since 1950. In 1943 Mrs. H said her husband had deserted. The case was closed after a neighbor reported that Mr. H had been in the home all the time and was employed. The neighbor complained of the family's unclean habits and drunken behavior, saying, "When the relief checks come the entire family become intoxicated." In 1947 and 1948 complaints were received regarding the care of the children, drinking, sale of "smoke," Mr. H's employment and the need for a careful investigation. In 1948 referral was made to Protective Services and the case was closed. In June 1950 OWD referred Mrs. H because her three daughters, born 1937, 1940, and 1942, were to be returned to her. In 1952 a complaint was received as to Mrs. H's drinking and failure to buy food for the children. When the worker visited Mrs. H was found "dead drunk." The record refers to many discussions as to employment, beginning in 1954. In 1955 she was to be given 3 months in which to find work and held to this. In March 1956 she was again given 3 months in which to find work, and in June 1956, the record says assistance was to be discontinued as of July 1, 1956. When nothing was heard from Mrs. H, a home visit was made and it was learned she had been sick. The last medical report for Mrs. H is dated August 11, 1956. No prognosis was given, the disability could be corrected or reduced and it is suggested that we inquire in 3 months as to when she will be able to work.

In 1957 there were only two daughters in the home, B and G. B had a baby by a 19-year-old boy and G was said to have a heart condition.

An entry dated May 1957, page 77, reads: "Mrs. H, 43 years old, is small, youthful appearing, and very neat. She is now employable and was actually seeking work when Gladys' illness became known. Now Gladys has to have long periods of bed rest and Mrs. H feels she is needed in the home to care for her child." The last recorded entry is dated December 18, 1957. "Mrs. H said she is in fairly good health herself and that she has been discharged from the clinic. She said further she has not sought any employment because of her need to care for Gladys." No medical information was found in relation to Gladys' illness.

CHILD-CARE PLAN SHOULD BE AVAILABLE

Case No. 52: Mrs. O applied for assistance September 27, 1955, saying she had no child-care plan for her 6-month-old baby and was therefore, unemployable. She gave up her

job at Mack's Waffle Shop because of pregnancy and had been collecting UCB benefits of \$19 a week. Her brother and his wife and her father lived at the same address. Many other relatives were listed in the District of Columbia. She said the father of her child, Lester K works at the Washington Post and that there is no continuing relationship. Intake explained the need for her to get Mr. K's address and for the Agency to talk with him. On October 7, 1955, she gave Mr. K's home address. She said she would ask him to come to the office on October 12, 1955. Apparently he did not keep this appointment because the application was terminated on November 14, 1955. Mrs. O reapplied October 22, 1956, for herself and two children. She said Lester K. was the father of the baby born March 1956. She was living with her father, her brother, his wife, and two children in an apartment described as "spacious."

From the record there would appear to be no reason why Mrs. O could not have accepted employment and made a child-care arrangement. Employment was discussed with her on a number of occasions. On October 22, 1956, she said she would like to work but could not make enough to pay for a child-care plan. On four other occasions employment was discussed. A child-care plan seemed to be available either with the sister-in-law or with one of Mr. K's relatives, none of whom was contacted.

CASE SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMS TO BE AVAILABLE

Case No. 19: Mrs. F applied in June 1958 saying she had been separated from Mr. F for 1 month. On July 2, 1958, referral was made by Intake to determine if Mr. F had access. An entry on form No. 246 says, "Mrs. F's relatives are well known to PAD. See 249." From form No. 252 it was learned that Mrs. F's mother receives GPA and three sisters receive ADC. These relatives all live close to her and it would appear they would be available to provide care for the children. Employment was discussed with Mrs. F who gave a number of excuses for not working. On August 27, 1958, Mr. K was found in the home. He said "he believes neighbors refer to him as Mrs. F's husband because Mr. F sometimes visits Mrs. F to see the children." On June 26, 1958, referral was made to IS to determine access of Mr. F or any man. On July 10, 1958, IS reported Mrs. F was not at the address given. Another referral was made on July 14, 1958, giving the new address. This address was also found to be incorrect and IS closed its case in September 1958. Re-referral was made on October 27, 1958, to determine access. This referral was made after the social worker had found a man in the home. On December 8, 1958, IS reported an accurate check could not be made because of the locked front door. IS also reported that Mrs. F appeared to be pregnant. A re-referral should have been made to determine access.

EXAMPLE OF CASE REFERRED FOR LOCATION—SHOULD BE REFERRED FOR ACCESS

Case No. 69: The "Retired" record could not be found for reading. According to the information on form No. 246, Mrs. W applied December 1949 because her "husband had been incarcerated for cutting." The case was closed after his release. She reapplied in August 1950 because Mr. W was "again in jail for fighting her." The case was closed when he returned to the home. Her next application was September 26, 1952. She said she was separated and living with a Mr. Thomas M and had just given birth to his child. The application was terminated when Mr. W was interviewed and agreed to support. She reapplied in October 1957 saying she had been employed since 1953 but had to give up her employment to look after her children. The case was closed in September 1958 when it was learned she had given birth

to another child and had work. She reapplied in November 25, 1958, saying she had to give up her job because her earnings were insufficient and she was no longer intimate with the baby's father. According to the entry on form No. 247, Family Group Sheet, Mrs. W has eight children; three with relatives out of the home and five with her. Mr. W is the father of two children; Mr. M, who is now in Lorton, is the father of two and Mr. John K, with whom she is no longer intimate, is the father of the youngest child.

Referral was made to IS in November 1957 to locate Mr. W. On December 9, 1957, IS reported that Mr. W was located. On December 15, 1958, re-referral was made to locate Mr. W. Form No. 122, prepared by caseworker No. 152, says, "Case closed. Request to locate Mr. K withdrawn by previous worker because Mr. K agreed to support voluntarily and signed form No. 57 on December 20, 1958." This entry is confusing because there was no referral to IS to locate Mr. K. Referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 27: Miss G was 33 years old when she applied for assistance in September 1956. She had received a disciplinary discharge from District of Columbia General Hospital, TB ward, because she failed to return after Labor Day weekend. She was approved for ATD in October 1956. She lived in what has been described by a member of the Woman's Bureau as the "red light district." Her residence was established by taverns and bars. On March 17, 1958, notice was received from R. & F. that Miss G had given birth to an infant on March 8, 1958. It was at this point that referral should have been made to IS to determine access. On April 8, 1958, the Woman's Bureau record was read. Their case opened in 1936 when eight children of Miss G's mother were removed after the fatal shooting of the husband. The mother was acquitted after relating a story of abject poverty and abuse. There were many other contacts with Miss G's mother regarding neglect of the children and disorderly conduct. Miss G's adult record at WB began in 1948. There was 12 arrests for drunken and disorderly conduct and 1 for assault. Miss G and her sister were involved with men and alcohol from a very early age. The brother's children were committed to DPW and his daughter accused him of attempted incest.

CASE SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF COMPLAINTS AND BEHAVIOR

Case No. 18: On October 15, 1958, Mrs. D applied for assistance saying she had to stop work because her husband has stopped supporting. She also said she was needed in the home to care for her mother. In 1954 the family moved to Mr. D's home in Cleveland. She remained there, except for visits to her mother, until October 1957 when she came back to be with her mother who was ill. She planned to return to her husband but he did not send enough money at any one time for her to make the trip. She said she had learned from friends in Cleveland that he had been "running around with another woman." She does not want to return to him. On November 17, 1958, a letter was written to the DPW in Cleveland. That agency replied on December 4, 1958. Mr. D told the agency he tried to furnish a home for Mrs. D and the children in Cleveland but she kept "running back home to see her relatives all the time," which was expensive. He said he had written to Mrs. D telling her he felt they should get a divorce. On December 4, 1958, a letter was received from Mr. D. He said he and his wife were forced into marriage by someone much older than they. He thought he would fall in love with his wife but she made it impossible by not conducting herself as a wife should. She was unclean about her person and she "went out

at night and came back drunk with the baby in her arms." While Mr. D was hospitalized she went out with other men. When he tried to talk with her she would "get mad and pack her clothes and leave me." He told of trying unsuccessfully to get his wife to come back to him. He said he was "fed up with her" and could not "stand any more." He said he would like to send money for his children to the agency instead of Mrs. D. He enclosed a letter written to him concerning Mrs. D who was "running wild" and "running crazy." She was described as staying away from her children all night and coming home drunk. She is also described as "about to run her mother crazy." She was said to have gone to Atlantic City with a man for a weekend. The money Mr. D sent was not spent on the children. It was suggested that Mr. D come and see for himself on Friday nights about 10:00 or 10:30. Mr. D requested an answer to his letter but there is no copy of a reply in the record.

No referral was made to IS. There is no verification of age or relationship for the younger child, Don. Form No. 248: Living Arrangements, says that Mrs. D is living with her mother rent free. In the record there is a rent receipt for \$55.00 in Mrs. D's name dated February 3, 1959.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED BECAUSE OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 73 and case No. 74: Mrs. Y had received assistance intermittently since 1934 and continuously since 1950. Prior to 1934 she was assisted by the Associated Charities. Mrs. Y seemed always to live beyond her income and there were two instances of overpayment; one in 1953 and one in 1956. Mrs. Y moved constantly without advising the agency. It was usually learned that she had moved only when a home visit was made or when checks were returned. In May 1956, there was discussion of employment. In the worker's opinion, there were enough adults in the home so that a plan could be worked out whereby Mrs. Y would not need assistance. As Mrs. Y's three daughters entered their teens each became pregnant. The case of one daughter, V, is also part of caseload No. 152. According to form No. 257, the mother, two children, and a brother are all receiving assistance. Mrs. Y is said to take the pregnancy of her daughters casually. According to an entry dated September 27, 1957, when she learned another daughter, P was pregnant, Mrs. Y was "not aware nor upset." She said she expected this daughter's marital relations with the father, who is still in school, to continue. The daughter, V, case No. 74, was 20 years old when she applied for assistance in March 1957. There are two references, March 26, 1957, and February 24, 1958, of referral to Information Service to locate Mr. B the father of Miss Y's youngest child. Information Service has no record of the referral and no copy was found in the record. The reviewer's decision was that little was to be gained by referral to Information Service of the mother's case but that referral should have been made in the daughter's case because of behavior and to locate the fathers of her children, even though the daughter had made no effort to do so.

REFERRAL SHOULD BE MADE ON BASIS OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 33: When Mrs. H applied in June 1954 she said Charles L did not support his 3-months-old child and was awaiting grand jury action on a narcotics charge. She said she had three children by her husband, who had deserted her in Texas. This was found later to be untrue. These three children are in Alabama with her mother who is also keeping Mrs. H's 19-month-old child by Mr. L. Mrs. H said the whole family was moving to District of Columbia soon, which they did. The application was terminated because Mrs. H's needs were being met by her brother. She reapplied in September

1954 for herself and five children. She said Mr. H had deserted in Alabama 3 years ago and Mr. L was in prison on a narcotics charge. On October 6, 1954, she said she met Mr. L when he was in the Armed Forces in Alabama and did not know he was married until she came to the District of Columbia. An entry dated April 7, 1955, says Mr. L's wife, Sylvia, is receiving ADC, case No. 518-332.0.

On August 19, 1955, a letter was received from the Department of Public Welfare in Athens, Tex., enclosing a letter Mrs. H had written to Mr. H's mother. (In an interview April 7, 1955, Mrs. H had said Mr. H's mother was dead.) In the letter to Mr. H's mother, Mrs. H explained the "lies" she had told the agency in order to get assistance. On February 14, 1958, Mrs. H bitterly attacked the agency because she was not able to have boyfriends and because of the lack of privacy. In May 1958 a portable phonograph was seen which Mrs. H said was a gift and she said an uncle wished to provide a telephone and a television.

REFERRAL SHOULD BE MADE ON BASIS OF BEHAVIOR

Case No. 23: Miss G has received assistance continuously since 1948. When she applied in May 1948 she had one child and was pregnant. She now has seven children.

She said she was not married to Mr. G but had lived with him since 1945. She applied because he was ill. He was admitted to Glenn Dale in 1950 and died in March 1951.

On February 5, 1951, a new baby was seen. Miss G said she had not reported this because the father of the baby was taking care of it. The worker asked Miss G to have the father of the baby come to the office to discuss his intentions to support her and the baby. This was not done and the case was closed. However, the check was continued in error. In June 1951 Miss G said that Comer B. was the father of her child. On May 20, 1952, there was a telephone conversation with Mr. B who said he was temporarily unemployed. He gave his address and said that he was giving Miss G \$4 a week.

On July 9, 1952, the birth of a new baby by Mr. B was discussed. She said, "Oh yes, I did not think you would hold my check, the children need food." The worker reminded her that in an interview on May 20, 1952, she had denied pregnancy. Miss G's reply was "We all tell little white lies once in a while."

March 15, 1954—Miss G is again pregnant by Mr. B who came to the office and said that he lives with his wife and five children.

Note: Mr. B has a long police record dating back to 1927 when he gave his age as 20.

On July 5, 1954, Miss G gave birth to her third child by Mr. B. In September 1956 Miss G was again pregnant and was reminded that she had said she had not seen or heard from Mr. B. Meanwhile, Mr. B has been incarcerated several times. In December 1956 she was told that when Mr. B was released she would receive no further assistance and that he would be expected to assume support for the entire family. An entry dated February 25, 1957, says that Mr. B was released and she was told her case would be closed. On April 8, 1957, Mr. B was held for murder and page 39 of the record says that he is in St. Elizabeths.

Referral was made to IS in 1955, 1956, and 1957 to locate Mr. B. The 1957 referral was withdrawn after Mr. B's arrest for murder.

In view of Miss G's past record and behavior, re-referral should be made to IS to determine access.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHER—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMS TO BE AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—ASSISTANCE GRANTED ON A TEMPORARY BASIS, BUT CONTINUED

Case No. 64: Miss S applied for assistance on July 1, 1953. She said she had to stop

work due to pregnancy and requested only temporary assistance. She said Mr. S deserted 6 weeks ago. She said she thought he was in Brooklyn working as a saxophone player. On July 6, 1953, Miss S telephoned to say that her husband had returned home and the application was terminated. On April 9, 1954, Mrs. S reapplied saying she was pregnant and her husband was in jail for selling narcotics. She said she has been selling insurance and hoped to make this her career. On April 16, 1954, she said she was living in the home with her mother and aunt and that the aunt is willing to provide shelter for her. On May 4, 1954, the aunt verified that she is willing for Mrs. S to remain in the home rent free.

On April 21, 1955, Mrs. S said she is no longer interested in selling insurance. "It seemed very hard for Mrs. S to accept the fact that a mother takes over part of the support whenever possible if the husband is not available. I pointed out to Mrs. S that when she applied for assistance she merely asked for assistance until her baby was born." She said she planned to live with Mr. S when he was released. On November 17, 1955, the worker pointed out that Mrs. S did not appear to have done very much about securing employment and wondered if she really wants to work. When the worker visited on April 16, 1956, she noted that Mrs. S and the children were still in bed when the worker arrived at 10 a.m. Mrs. S said they never get up before 10 in the morning because they are up late at night and the children take naps. On September 25, 1958, Mrs. S's mother-in-law came to the office to say that the Agency should be interested in knowing how Mrs. S had been using the money she receives from the Agency. She wanted to tell this some time ago but felt that Mrs. S would improve. Since Mrs. S had done nothing to try to do better she felt it was her place to notify the Agency so that an investigation could be made. She told of Mrs. S going with a Louis P and remaining with him for as long as 3 or 4 days. Mr. P is a musician and does not get off from work until early in the morning. At 2 or 3 a.m. Mrs. S goes to his home. The children are left with Mrs. S's mother who cannot properly care for them because of her paralytic condition. She said she "just could not stand it any longer with her son coming home from prison to someone like Mrs. S." Mrs. S misuses the money she receives from the Agency. She said that Mrs. S had been working for her as an agent during the summer selling merchandise. She believes Mrs. S is a call girl at a house on T Street, across from the Howard Theater and is of the opinion that Mrs. S uses dope. At times she has smelled whisky on Mrs. S's breath. She said Mrs. S manages to get back home about the time she thinks the worker will visit. Mrs. S's check was held and on October 5, 1956, a visit was made and there was a long discussion with Mrs. S. The workers told her of reports she stays with a boyfriend for 2 or 3 days. Mrs. S "wondered just why she could not have a boyfriend when her husband has been in prison for almost 3 years. Any woman would want a man." She admitted having a boyfriend but refused to give his name. She refused to discuss the matter of whether she goes to her boyfriend's for 2 or 3 days at a time. When asked about frequently going to the T Street address, she jumped up and screamed that a lie had been told.

On October 11, 1956, the Woman's Bureau telephoned. The Woman's Bureau felt there was something wrong in this situation. Mrs. S's mother admitted that Mrs. S drinks and stays away from home 2 or 3 nights at a time. The worker explained to Mrs. S that assistance would be discontinued because she was not willing to give information nor to have a further investigation made. After the worker explained to Mrs. S that assistance

would be discontinued, she notes that the case was discussed with the supervisor and it was decided that the case should not be closed at this time but that a letter should be written giving her an office appointment. On October 16, 1956, Mrs. S was interviewed by the supervisor and had decided after discussion with her mother and her aunt that "she would not go through with receiving public assistance." The supervisor pointed out the need for the investigation of all resources. Mrs. S said her husband would be released about January 25, 1957, and she felt she would be able to support the two children from her employment until that time. On April 4, 1958, Mrs. S reapplied for assistance. She had given birth to a child on March 20, 1958, and was unable to work. She is still living with her aunt, her mother, and three cousins. She said Mr. S had deserted in February 1957 after she had asked him to leave her mother's home. She said Rudy W was the father of her last baby. Mr. W is a musician who travels and did not know of her pregnancy. The baby is now with a family who want to adopt him. Mrs. S was told that referral would be made to I.S. to locate her husband. Referral was made to I.S. April 11, 1958, by the Intake worker to locate Mr. S. and to determine access. On July 17, 1958, I.S. reported no man was found present in the home after several visits.

An entry dated May 22, 1958, said that the shelter costs were prorated although the aunt had said on several occasions she would not charge any rent. There is no record of any recent discussion with the aunt. The ADC policy concerning access to the home was discussed. Mrs. S said she had "done a great deal of growing up in the past year."

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—MAN LOCATED—NO ACTION TAKEN—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—CHILD CARE PLAN SHOULD BE AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 38: Miss J's applications for assistance in 1948 and 1949 were terminated because she was employed or employable. When she reapplied May 25, 1950, she said she was pregnant and could not continue to work. She was told that no assistance could be authorized until she made efforts to locate the father of her unborn child. The application was terminated. She reapplied in December 1950. She gave the last name and address of the man responsible for her last pregnancy. She said she had lived with Frank S. Miss J was told by Intake that we would need to see the fathers of her children before assistance could be continued. The case was closed in May 1951 after the landlord reported that a man had helped Miss J move and her address was unknown. Miss J reapplied July 23, 1951. She was told by Intake it would be necessary for the Agency to see Mr. M, the father of her older child; Mr. T, the father of her younger child and Mr. S with whom she had been living. The application was terminated in August. On August 28, 1951, she applied again. She said she could not bring the two fathers to the office. No mention was made of Mr. S at this time and he is not mentioned again in the record. After conference with the supervisor, it was decided Miss J had made efforts to locate the fathers and a grant was authorized. In April 1952, when Miss J inquired about renting an apartment, she asked about the privilege of entertaining men. Also in April 1952, child care arrangements were discussed and Miss J said she preferred to remain on assistance. The record shows that child care plans and employment were discussed in May 1953 and June 1954. At the time of the June 23, 1954, visit, the worker noted that Miss J was just getting up at the time of the visit which was at 1 p.m. On July 30, 1954, a report was received that Miss J and the children were being supported by Mr. G, "who gives her everything she wants." In August 1954 this

report was discussed with Miss J and the need to have Mr. G come to the office. "Miss J said she was not going to do this because she did not want to have anything to do with him and if we wanted to withhold assistance, that would be all right with her." She came in later "to tell me she had done all she intended to do and wanted her check for September 1954." Under date of September 24, 1954, the following entry is made: "Mr. G in office, said they are no longer friends but she has another man. Knows where father of both children are." On September 27, 1954, Miss J brought Mr. G to the office. He said he had known Miss J only a short while. "He stated that he met her one day while sitting in the park and that she told him of her plight and he felt sorry for her and loaned her \$20. * * * He emphatically stated that he was not her boyfriend and had nothing to do with Miss J."

There was no reference in this interview to Mr. G's statement on August 24 that Miss J "has another man." On December 16, 1954, employment was discussed and the worker explained that assistance was being put on a temporary basis so that she could put forth efforts to locate work and locate the fathers of her children. On June 23, 1955, it was noted that Miss J appeared to be pregnant. She denied this. There was also discussion regarding Mr. M and Mr. T, the fathers of Miss J's two children. She said she did not know where they were. The worker also noticed a comparatively new 21-inch television. Miss J said this had been purchased by her sister-in-law's husband. "Miss J became very upset. She stated that if she had to secure all that information concerning the television she did not see any need of going on accepting assistance. She stated that Public Assistance has been worrying her about different things for the past 4 years and she was tired of them 'heckling' about everything. She further stated that there was no need to drill on her about the television. She was not going to make any effort to secure any information concerning the television. Miss J explained that she was not coming to the office to bring information or to do anything further. We could withdraw aid. She did not know how she would manage but she was just tired of being worried to death by PAD." The worker explained that Miss J would be given until July 15, 1955, to bring in information concerning the fathers of her children and the television. Miss J said we could set any date we desired, she was not coming to the office and she wanted assistance discontinued. It was recommended that assistance be discontinued but it would appear that the case was not closed. During July 1955, Miss J was in the office several times to discuss her continued eligibility for assistance. In August the case was closed because Miss J refused to comply with the Agency's policy concerning the television, to clarify her present living arrangements, and to have the fathers of the children visit the office concerning plans for the care and support of the children.

Six other reapplications were terminated during 1956 and 1958. On November 10, 1958, Miss J made her 13th application for assistance. She said that she was physically unable to work more than 1 day a week. She had been meeting her needs mainly through her paramour, Charles A. An entry on form No. 258, "Deprivation of parental support—ADC," says that Mr. M's address is unknown. She said that Ernest T is under court order to pay \$6 a week. His address is also unknown. She said both men are married. On form No. 252, Charles A is listed as a paramour, address unknown. Miss J was referred to DCGH November 10, 1958, but there is no medical information in the record. Miss J said that Mr. A was a "shellshocked drunkard." She said she did not know how to begin looking for him and was afraid to continue any association with him. Emergency

assistance was authorized and referral to I.S. made by Intake to locate Mr. T and to determine if any man has access to the home. On January 8, 1959, I.S. located Mr. T in D.C. I.S. report of February 5, 1959, was not found in the case record. In this report no man was found in the home but the circumstances were suspicious and referral was suggested.

The Agency's requirements to which Miss J had been held at the time of her previous 12 applications were disregarded and the emergency assistance was authorized. The review date was set for October 31, 1959. In the recorded interview December 17, 1958, the reviewer sensed that Miss J was "settling down on assistance." Nothing was required of her and she said she was glad that she was able to establish eligibility for assistance again, and believed things would be better for her and the children from now on. She added that she believed that she could keep her eligibility clear by cooperating with Agency and maintaining a satisfactory home for her children.

NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE—SHOULD BE REFERRED TO DETERMINE ACCESS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 12 and case No. 13: Miss J. D. and Miss E. D. are sisters, both receiving assistance. Their mother is also receiving assistance. The three assistance payments for March 1959 totaled \$517.00. The mother's case is not a part of caseload No. 152 and was not read. The CWD record on Miss J. D. was read.

Miss J. D., age nineteen, applied in May 1957. She had one child, was pregnant and lived with her parents who were receiving ADC. The need to talk with the fathers of her children was explained. She failed to provide information and the application was terminated. She reapplied in November 1957. Her sister, E., was receiving assistance for her four children and Miss D. said the mother wanted the daughters to move away. No discussion regarding need to talk with the fathers is recorded. Assistance was authorized. In January 1958 the J.C. reported a finding of "not guilty" because Miss D.'s testimony indicated a pattern of promiscuity. She admitted relations with 2 men prior to and during both pregnancies.

In February 1958 assistance was continued on a temporary basis while Miss D. looked for work. She seemed to make no effort to find employment and the case was closed in June 1958, since both her mother and sister were in the home. She reapplied in December 1958, saying her mother was planning to go to work and her sister had moved away. An EA grant was authorized, and no discussion recorded as to need to talk with fathers. No address was shown on the application form and no information found as to living arrangements. The finding of the reviewer was that referral to I.S. did not appear to be indicated at this time since Miss D. had not been required to make any effort to locate the fathers and since it would seem that either the mother or the sister receiving assistance could be expected to care for the children while Miss D. worked.

The CWD record, No. T15673, was read. Miss D. was committed in 1954 for "revoke of probation." She was placed in probation following a period of truancy. She was disorderly and belligerent in school. The case was in court in November 1955. Miss D. was disorderly in a grill and had been drinking and cursing. She ran away from B.P. in April 1954 and was "lost to the Agency until October 1955." She said when she ran away she had been "right at home." (Presumably in the home of her mother receiving ADC.) The CWD record made no mention of the mother receiving assistance. The CWD record mentions a Mr. O. Miss D. said she had known him for a long time and stayed frequently

with him at his address. She said he visited her in her home most of the time and she would probably continue going with him. CWD decided J. should return to her home. In August 1956 there was another complaint of drunk and disorderly at 2:30 a.m.

Miss E. D. applied for assistance in June 1955. (She was not yet nineteen. She had two children. When the record was read in March 1959 she had four children and was pregnant.) The children were with relatives. The application was terminated and she was advised to look for work. "The applicant seemed to resent such a suggestion and said she had never worked."

She applied again in December 1955 saying she was pregnant by Mr. S, the father of her two children. Mr. S was incarcerated. The application was terminated since he was to be released in about 2 weeks. She reapplied in May 1957 for herself and four children. The father of all the children, Mr. S, was in prison for nonsupport. "Mrs. S is aware of Mr. S' family by Miss D and both mothers are applying for ADC at this time. Miss D said Mr. S keeps regularly employed but finds it impossible to support two growing families. * * * Miss D seems to be competing with Mrs. S. and wants to believe he will divorce his wife and marry her. She refers to him as her husband and did not deny that their relationship will be resumed upon his release." She said her relationship with Mr. S began when she was 14 and he was 18. Mr. S was already married, but made repeated promises to get a divorce and marry her. Miss D said her life at home had not been good. "In addition, she said Mrs. D was so preoccupied in her own love affairs that they had to make their own decisions and grow up as best they could." It was decided in conference with the supervisor and District Supervisor "that putting another grant into the D's household would not help our applicant." Mr. S was to be released soon and it was felt that Miss D should seek employment, and try to acquire some skill. Before the case was closed in June 1957, "Miss D. talked with me at some length about how she perhaps would not find herself in this predicament if she had had the benefit of some guidance. She was not bitter toward her mother but said that her mother had not had the benefit of guidance either since her family had begun when she was 14 years old." Miss D. reapplied December 23, 1957. She said she wanted to move out of her mother's home. She said she no longer sees Mr. S. She is pregnant by Mr. R, who came to the office and gave his employer and address. He agreed to support "their children voluntarily." He plans to reunite with his legal family. In view of Miss D's past behavior, referral to I.S. should have been made to determine access. Mr. S was never seen.

CASE SHOULD BE REFERRED—HUSBAND'S ADDRESS KNOWN BUT NO ACTION TAKEN—NO EFFORTS BY MOTHER TO LOCATE THE FATHER—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 14: At the time of Mrs. D's first application October 20, 1954, she had three children and was pregnant. She asked assistance to supplement the court order of \$10 a week from her husband. She said that the nurse in the clinic suggested she apply for ADC and stay in the home with her children. She was employed and decided that she would be better off to continue work and find someone to care for her children. She moved leaving no address and the application was terminated due to loss of contact. She reapplied in July 1957, saying that her husband had been out of the home for 5 months. The aunt, in whose home she lives, has helped her. She received \$2,000 from her father's estate and said she put \$800 down on a home. Her husband did not pay the notes on the property but paid on a car instead.

She had also been doing some work. On July 19, 1957, Mrs. D said that Mr. D was actually her common law husband. He lived with her for 10 years until February 1957 when he left the family. She gave the name of his employer. "She said that she was at her wit's end, that she has tried everything, she has tried to have something, to own a piece of property, to make a future for her children, and her husband had just seemed to do everything he could possibly do to destroy all the good that has come out of her efforts." She has made up her mind that he cannot return to the home.

He likes to run around and show off and take no responsibility. On July 29, 1957, when the worker visited the home, Mr. D was there. He said he was not aware of his wife's application for assistance or that the family had been threatened with eviction. When Mrs. D had made her application she said he had deserted the family in February 1957 and she did not know where he lived. Mrs. D's aunt, Mrs. E, was also present during the interview and she and Mr. D "hurled accusations at each other." Mrs. D had made a downpayment on the home from an inheritance left by her father. The aunt and uncle moved in supposedly on a temporary basis. They were supposed to share shelter expenses, but Mr. E was out of work. Mr. D grew tired of supporting the E family. After the foreclosure, the house was rented to the E's and Mrs. E told Mr. D to get out. He left the home in April 1957 and asked Mrs. D and the children to come with him to a house he had rented. She refused to move with him because she said she thought he might have another woman living there. He said he visits the home three or four times a week, makes repairs, cuts the boys' hair. Mrs. D spent the night with him in his rooms one night the previous week. He said he was trying to get Mrs. D away from her relatives. He has brought food each week. He said Mrs. D had told him he was too old for her. Mrs. D said she thought she should stay with her aunt so that she could care for the children while Mrs. D worked. Mr. D wanted to rent an apartment for the family. On July 31, 1957, Mr. D said that Mrs. D had decided to remain in the aunt's home so that she could work and Mrs. E could look after the children. He thinks Mrs. D may be interested in a younger man she has permitted to come there. He thinks someone has told Mrs. D that she could work, obtain support from him, and also receive assistance. The application was terminated in August 1957. Mr. D was to continue to provide food, clothing, and incidentals for the family and a share of the shelter expenses. On January 21, 1958, the aunt's employer telephoned to say that Mr. D had deserted. On February 20, 1958, Mrs. D reapplied. She said that Mr. D separated from the family and was not supporting except for occasional small amounts of food. They were evicted and forced to move with Mrs. E. Emergency assistance was authorized "due to emergency need" and the Intake worker noted on form No. 246 that Mr. D's absence was to be confirmed through I.S. and that Mr. D was to be seen regarding support. An undated entry on form No. 246 reads: "Interview with Mr. D established that absence did not exist. Family was split by eviction. Mr. D supporting family to the best of his ability. Mrs. D never able to come in with Mr. D but admits that Mr. D not absent at first but does not want him now." Mrs. D refused her husband's offer of a home. The case was recommended for closing under code 8—"Originally ineligible under State plan."

On May 26, 1958, CWD referred Mrs. D and the children. The referral states that Mr. D had deserted in February 1958 and that Mrs. D and the children were sheltered temporarily by Mrs. E. The referral said that Mr. D's whereabouts were unknown and she

did not intend to resume her common law relationship with him. Mrs. D impressed CWD as a mother who is sincerely interested in her children, who are in Junior Village. On June 9, 1958, Mrs. D reapplied, saying she wanted to reestablish a home for the children. She is working but said she would need to stop work and stay home with the children. She said she would not consider going back with Mr. D. Mrs. D was told that the Agency can assist her when she has a place large enough to accommodate the family. After a conference with CWD on August 12, 1958, emergency assistance was authorized. The following entry is made on Form No. 246. "Deprivation of parental support exists because of continued absence. Mr. D, common law husband of Mrs. D and father of all children denied paternity at J.C. on June 23, 1958, and case was referred to Corporation Counsel. See form No. 241. Hearing to be held on August 14, 1958."

An entry on form 259 reads in part as follows: "Contacts we have had with the father gives picture of sincere intent and acknowledgement of responsibility * * *. Was seen in PAD on February 25 after Mrs. D. received EA * * *. He contends children need and want him. He says neglect of children, if any, due to mother's unconcern and desire for immorality."

Although Mrs. D's statements were found to be untrue on two previous applications, emergency assistance was again authorized and no attempt made to talk with Mr. D. Mrs. D's grant of \$203.00 continues with a review date set for June 30, 1959. There is no dictation by the present worker and no report on the J.C. hearing set for August 14, 1958. This case was accepted without any attempt to talk with Mr. D, whose address is known and his previous statements concerning support and interest in the children were known. Since the case was accepted, policy requires referral to I.S. No referral was made.

CASE SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED—FATHER NOT SEEN ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO HAVE FATHER COME TO OFFICE

Case No. 26: Miss H was 23 years old when she applied in May 1955 for herself and four children. She said that the children's father, Mr. D, with whom she had been living had left the home. Miss H knew where he was working and in view of his availability and employability, the application was terminated. She reapplied again in May 1955. She said she could not find Mr. D and then later said she thought she could find him. This application was terminated due to failure to obtain support. In July 1955 she came in again to apply for ADC. She was pregnant and said that Mr. D was not the father of the expected child. This application was terminated because of failure to obtain support from the father of the children. She reapplied in September 1955. The two oldest children were in Junior Village. She named Frank H as the father of her unborn child. She said she sees him twice a week but has no marital relations with him, because he said he would not be responsible for anyone in her present condition. The location of Mr. D was explained as a condition of eligibility. Mr. H. was seen. He has a wife and three children and was planning to live again with his wife. He said he had not been intimate with Miss H since September 1955. He confirmed her statements that their intimacies always took place at his home. He was undecided as to continuing his relationship with Miss H and said he would let the worker know on October 10 what he planned to do about this. On October 21, 1955, Miss H told a weird story about not knowing who the father of

her second child was because she had "a few drinks" and had been dragged into an alley by five men, all of whom were intimate with her. On October 27, 1955, the worker read the Women's Bureau record. Miss H. was known to them for drunk and disorderly conduct and was brought in five times from 1953 to 1955. On November 4, 1955, Mr. H came to the office and said he planned to live with his wife in North Carolina. On December 6, 1955, a visit was made to Mrs. C, who said Miss H was her adopted daughter. Mrs. C said that when Miss H was young she refused to mind and was placed in a home. "Since she had been discharged from the home she has been having children regularly." Mrs. C's son sees Mr. D every day. On December 8, 1955, a visit was made to the home of Mrs. C's son. "He said he did not think Miss H could ever be a good mother and that whether she got on the welfare or not would not make any difference in her behavior because she likes to live around from hand to mouth and have babies."

It seemed to him that Miss H. did not want to work. He thought the children are better off away from Miss H. On December 8, 1955, a conference was held with CWD. "Much discussion went on concerning Miss H's behavior as a mother and meeting public assistance requirements. Conclusion: CWD is willing to have the children returned to the home with supervision from their agency provided public assistance is granted." On January 11, 1956 Mr. D. was seen in the Juvenile Court worker's office. He denied paternity of all but two children. "Mr. D. explained that he would love to live with Miss H. again in order that the whole family could be together even though he knows R. and D. are not his children. This makes no difference to him. He stated he could overlook Miss H's faults because he really loved Miss H." He said Miss H. had known where he was and has seen him constantly. He visits at least once a week. He said the father of the coming baby could be anyone because Miss H. was constantly out in the street.

On January 13 and 18, 1956, there were long interviews with Miss H. and Mr. D. It was pointed out that the agency did not consider them to be separated. Mr. D. tried to live with Miss H. and wanted to accept all the children but she did not act toward him as a wife should and he was not going to live with her. His decision was accepted and a grant authorized. Later it was decided that the assistance payment could not be approved because Miss H. had not demonstrated that she could be a responsible mother. CWD was notified that the grant was not approved as planned. On March 13, 1956, Miss H. was again in office and there was a long discussion regarding her behavior. She admitted that she had left the children on different occasions. She feels she can be a good mother. She said she had left the children to obtain money for food and rent. She had gone to gambling houses because she knew Mr. D. could be found there and she had on occasions tried her own luck. Her drinking began when she became angry visit was paid to Mrs. C, Miss H's adoptive visit was paid to Mrs. C, Miss H's adoptive mother. Miss H. had recently been in her home but she had to ask her to move. She took Miss H. in because of her pregnancy. Miss H. allowed Mr. D. to come there. Miss H. expected Mrs. C. to stay home with the children while she ran the streets. Miss H. left the children twice and did not return until morning. She doesn't feel that Miss H. will change as long as she hangs with that group of girls on 7th Street, they only want to drink and stay with one man after another for one meal and later end up with children they cannot support. Mrs. C.

doubts that Miss H. really wants her children. She feels that Miss H. should not have her 8 year old daughter because of the men Miss H. has coming and going in the home. She believes that this child was attacked by a man when she was left alone. She does not believe Miss H. will stay in the home and care for her children properly. She has always had trouble with Miss H. and that is the reason why she had her committed to CWD some time back. She believes if she works she would not have time to run the streets. She has never worked since she has been grown. She merely drags the children from place to place. On March 21, 1956, there was another conference with CWD who believed that Miss H. has never had a chance to see what she could do if she had financial support. On March 23, 1956, the worker and supervisor decided to approve Miss H's grant for a 2-week period with both CWD and PAD watching the situation very closely to determine Miss H's adequacy as a parent. This was explained carefully to Miss H. on March 26, 1956. On April 19, 1956, notation is made that the case is being referred to I.S. so that Miss H's home will be under surveillance night and day to determine whether she is following through on the advice given. It was planned with CWD to have Miss H's three children returned to the home with close supervision. Assistance was authorized on a monthly basis because of Miss H's promiscuous behavior and evidence of being a weak parent.

In June 1956 the case was transferred to another worker. An entry dated June 8, 1956, refers to a referral to I.S. to locate Mr. D, but the request to I.S. does not mention this. On July 12, 1956, the Woman's Bureau telephoned to say that Miss H had left the children alone at 2 a.m. Miss H said she had gone out to find Mr. D. She was told by PAD that another such report would mean referral to CWD. On September 17, 1956, I.S. reported no man seen in the home. On October 3, 1956 Mr. D. was in the office. He told of living with Miss H. and of their frequent separations. He said their last separation was because Miss H. would go out "and stay until the wee hours of morning." He said he has tried hard to provide a home and has begged Miss H. to change. He said she drinks excessively. He talked about how much he loved Miss H. On October 4, 1956, worker told Miss H. of the interview with Mr. D. She said she sees him often as he is fond of the children and comes to see them. He has proved himself to be an irresponsible person who does not care whether the family has food or not when he gambles. "She told the worker a great deal about the underworld, about gambling, homosexuality and prostitution. She wanted worker to know though that she had no part in any of these but that she had lived in the environment of people who indulged in all of them. She talked about her many incarcerations and what her life had been like inside of Woman's Bureau and jails. She said she knew she had many weaknesses but felt she could work them out herself." On October 15, 1956, the landlady called to complain about the rent and Miss H's neglect of the children. On October 23, 1956, the Woman's Bureau called to say that Miss H. was placed in jail, charged with being drunk and disorderly. This information was given to CWD and the children were placed in Junior Village. The case was closed in January 1957. CWD felt that Miss H. was not ready to have the children returned to her. Miss H. reapplied August 14, 1958, having been referred by CWD. An entry on form No. 25-8 says Miss H. is employed as a dishwasher at Normandy Farms and will have to give up her employment when the children are returned home. An entry on form No. 246,

dated August 21, 1958, says that Miss H. has an infant son born February 15, 1958, and that she is again separated from Mr. D. On August 26, 1958, referral was made by intake to I.S. to establish the absence of Mr. D. Miss H. said she has severed her relationship with her undesirable companions and will try to work toward greater responsibility in regard to the care and supervision of her children. Emergency assistance was authorized with the review date set for September 30, 1959. There is no record of any attempt since the last application to talk with Mr. D., whose relationship with Miss H. began in 1945 and has continued. His address is given on form No. 252-A. I.S. report dated September 22, 1958, says: "On September 22, 1958, I was advised by Miss Jones, social worker, that we had no authority to investigate this case and that it should not have been referred as Miss H. is not receiving a grant until October 1, 1958, and that child care arrangements have been arranged and that Miss H.'s children will not be returned to the home until all arrangements have been completed. In view of the above I.S. is closing the investigation." The entry on form No. 122, dated November 5, 1958, reads: "Request is withdrawn, knew of employment. Children being returned October 1, 1958. New request will be sent for information as to whether any man has free access to the home." There is no record of referral.

CASES REFERRED FOR ONE REASON SHOULD BE REFERRED FOR ANOTHER—NO EFFORT MADE BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 61: Mrs. S. was 23 when she applied for assistance in July 1950. (At the time of application she had 2 children. She has had 3 other children since that time.) She said she had separated from her husband 6 months ago.

Then she said she and her husband had never lived together since their marriage, "because of his failure to find a place for themselves." She is living with her mother and Mr. S. is living with his mother in the same block of O Street. This has continued since their marriage. Mrs. S. had two children at the time of application, one by Mr. S. and the older one by Samuel B., who had disappeared. Mrs. S.'s mother said Mrs. S. and the children could remain in the home without paying shelter costs. The worker talked with Mr. S.'s mother by telephone and she said she did not know where her son was living. On February 8, 1951, Mrs. S. told worker she had given birth to a son on January 4, 1951. The father of the child was Henry D. She said he "lives in the home with her mother" and has "several other children in the neighborhood." The worker talked with him by telephone on January 19, 1951, regarding support he was giving to another ADC recipient for the support of her two children. He buys milk and clothing for his child by Mrs. S. On October 17, 1952, and July 12, 1953, Mr. S. was arrested for violation of ABC regulations. On March 29, 1954, Mrs. S.'s mother telephoned to say she had to give up her home and is living with a friend. On August 11, 1954, Mr. and Mrs. S. were in the office. At first he said he would be willing to live with his family. "Mr. S. said he sees his child and Mrs. S. very often and when worker said that Mrs. S. had advised she had not seen him and that she had no idea where he was living, he just looked at her." "After Mr. S. said he would be willing to go back and live with Mrs. S. she spoke up and said, 'you know you have a girlfriend and I have a boyfriend,' and they asked the worker if it would be all right if they talked a little bit alone. So the worker left the booth for a few minutes. After I returned to the booth Mrs. S. said she did not wish to go back to live with her husband. We then advised her that there

was very little doubt that we could continue giving her assistance since her husband said he would be willing to live with her." She said her boyfriend is Robert H. and that he comes to see her two or three times a week and usually each weekend. Mr. H. called the worker the following day and said in an angry tone that he is not responsible for the support of Mrs. S. and her children and he did not think it was any of our business to inquire as to his circumstances and that he only helps her out when she runs short. Mrs. S. said she expected a job and had found a woman to look after the children. The case was closed. Mrs. S. reapplied November 15, 1954 and November 18, 1954. These applications were terminated because Mrs. S. was employable. The Notice of Ineligibility, form No. 12, dated November 15, 1954, contains the following paragraph: "If you should re-apply for assistance it would be necessary for us to have some contact from Mr. Robert H. as to his plans for the family, if any, and some effort would have to be made to try to locate and obtain support from Mr. B. and Mr. D."

On August 22, 1958, Mrs. S. re-applied for assistance. She has been working but had to stop because the children have been sick. She said she planned to return to work when her children are well again. Since her case was closed, two more children have been born. She named Robert H. as the father. Referral to I.S. was made by intake October 22, 1958, to locate Mr. S. and Samuel B. An entry on form No. 258—Deprivation of Parental Support—ADC, says there is no continuing relationship with any of the fathers of her children. She gave Robert H.'s address. She said he had not seen Mr. B. for several years and did not know his whereabouts. She said she has not seen Mr. S. in 3 or 4 years. Mr. D. she said, was under court order to pay for the support of his child. According to longhand notes in the record, dated November 4, 1958, she said she did not know where Mr. S. is living except "in the 2000 block of 14th Street NW." She said his child visits him and she will give him a card asking him to telephone for an interview. "As to the other fathers, Mrs. S. claims no knowledge of their whereabouts. Mr. H. is now said to be in New York City." It was noted that on March 29, 1954, Mrs. S.'s mother had said she was forced to give up her home and was living with a friend.

However, her address at the time of this application was given as 936 O Street where she had lived with Mr. S. and had been offered rent free.

The referral by intake to IS was for the location of Mr. S. and Mr. B. There was no referral for the location of Henry D. Robert H.'s address is given on form No. 258. Referral should have been made to IS to determine access. No effort was required by Mrs. S. to have any of the fathers come to the office.

SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED BECAUSE OF DENUNCIATION, TO LOCATE FATHERS, AND TO DETERMINE ACCESS—NO REAL EFFORT BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHERS—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 55: Mrs. R. applied for assistance in April 1948 for herself and two children. There have been four other pregnancies since she has been receiving assistance. She lived with her mother, Amanda Newman, who was receiving GPA. She worked until she became ill and her mother cared for the children. She returned to work and the application was terminated. She applied again in January 1949 because of pregnancy. She said Laddim B., the father of the expected child, has been helping her. He lives with his wife. She gave Mr. R.'s address in Cleveland and said he was contributing through the D.A.'s office. She gave Mr. B.'s Washing-

ton address and assistance was authorized with the understanding that she would contact Mr. B. and have him come to the office. The worker talked with Mrs. N., who was identified as Mrs. R.'s grandmother. She described Mrs. R. as irresponsible and unappreciative of the efforts Mrs. N. had made in caring for the children. She described Mr. B. as "no good." The Public Health Nurse said Mrs. N. had "hinted that Mrs. R. was promiscuous." On February 15, 1951, when the worker talked with Mrs. R. concerning employment, she said she was expecting a child in April. She named Mr. John S. as the father and was told that we would like to talk with him. She said at the time of this interview that Mr. B. lives now in North Carolina. On March 5, 1951, Mr. S. telephoned to say that he would give \$10 a week. He came in in April to say that he was not working. In an undated entry on page 13 of the record the worker discussed plans for returning to work and Mrs. R. said she had none. "In discussing the situation of the family, it was to be noted that Mrs. R. participated very little in saying anything and even started reading the newspaper, apparently ignoring worker during the interview * * *. Worker has attempted to impress upon Mrs. R. that the Agency will not be able to go along with her unless she attempts to show some cooperation and ambition in assisting her total family picture." "Mrs. N. told worker she was very upset at Mrs. R.'s history of illegitimate children." She told of friends who used to be kind to her and give her gifts, avoiding her because she lived with Mrs. R. and withholding gifts which they felt would benefit Mrs. R. On March 6, 1952, Mrs. N. telephoned and worker learned that Mrs. R. had had a miscarriage in February. Mr. S. was responsible. Mrs. R. came to the office on March 10, 1952, and was told that assistance could no longer be continued because absence could not be established. Mrs. R. kept the two youngest children with her and the older two remained with Mrs. N., who received ADC for them. Mrs. R. reapplied for assistance in September 1952 saying she was again pregnant by Mr. S. On October 7, 1952, "Mrs. R. was advised that we definitely had to see Mr. S. and we left the responsibility to her to secure his cooperation in coming into the office."

On September 11, 1953, worker expressed the opinion that Mrs. R. had "made no considerable effort toward locating Mr. S." In an undated entry on page 29 the worker told Mrs. R. that she would be expected to find employment and care for the children and that the Agency would not go along with her previous type of behavior. On December 1, 1955, the landlady telephoned to say that a Mr. James H. was living with Mrs. R. She said that Mrs. R. had requested that Mr. H. be allowed to stay a little longer and she had refused. She said she felt that Mrs. R. was going to move in order to continue living with Mr. H. The landlady's statements were discussed with Mrs. R. on December 5, 1955, and she denied that Mr. H. was her boy friend. She said she had not seen Mr. H. but would try and get in touch with him. On December 14, 1955, Mr. H. came to the office. He described the landlady as "crazy." He said he had helped Mrs. R. to move and that he had no interest in her. On December 16, 1955, referral was made to R.I.U. to locate Mr. B. and Mr. S. Investigation Service located Mr. B. in South Carolina and Mr. S. in District of Columbia General Hospital. On February 29, 1956, Mr. S. was seen in District of Columbia General Hospital. He said he had not seen Mrs. R. for over 2 years. "Mr. S. stated that back in 1953, or whenever they were together, he caught her with a fellow. He stated that it surprised him as this was

the fellow that she had gone with before. However, he thought they had discontinued their relationship. He stated that as the result, he sometimes wondered if the children were his. Mr. S stated that he does not see Mrs. R and does not plan to because of her conduct when they were together." On May 17, 1956, a letter was received from Mr. R in Cleveland, Ohio. He said he had not seen Mrs. R since 1953 or lived with her since 1942. There is no record that this letter was acknowledged. On March 26, 1957, a memorandum was received from the Investigation Service saying a report had been received that a man was living with Mrs. R. This report was not discussed with Mrs. R until May 3, 1957. "Mrs. R received this information jubilantly, laughed and said no man did not live in the home with her * * *." On December 12, 1958, a discussion of the ADC policy is recorded. No referral was made to Investigation Service in spite of the many complaints of Mrs. R's behavior.

CASES SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED—NO ACTION AFTER LOCATION

Case No. 66: Miss T, age 23, applied November 1, 1951. The father of her expected child was Charles H. She gave his District of Columbia address and said that he worked in Baltimore. She said he stopped seeing her when he learned she was pregnant. In January 1953, the case was closed after it was learned that she was again pregnant by Mr. H. Miss T requested an appeal and in March 1953 it was decided to accept another application. She said she had not seen Mr. H since December 1952 but that she made a child care plan and was looking for work. The application was terminated when she failed to provide information needed to establish eligibility. She reapplied March 18, 1954, saying she was pregnant by Johnny C. She gave his address and social security number. She was told on March 23, 1954, that the Agency "would be interested" in talking with Mr. H as to his plans for his children. She was "informed that the Agency would also have to talk to Mr. C before any further consideration could be given to her application." In August 1954 she said she wanted help until she could get work. Assistance was authorized on a temporary basis and on July 29, 1955, she was told again that Mr. H and Mr. C must be seen. On December 21, 1955, referral was made to Investigation Service to establish the presence or absence of Mr. C and Mr. H. On December 29, 1955, Investigation Service reported they had located both Mr. C and Mr. H. Mr. C was advised by Investigation Service that the social worker would contact him and that Mr. H would contact the social worker on February 23, 1956. Both these men have police records. Entries dated September 17, 1958, on forms 247 and 248 say that Mr. C was found not guilty of paternity. The record also contains a voluntary support agreement, form No. 57, dated February 1959 which could not be read but on which the name appeared to be Thomas S.

The Agency has had no contact with either Mr. H or Mr. C in spite of repeated statements to Miss T that this was necessary. There was no referral to Investigation Service regarding access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD BE RE-REFERRED

Case No. 37: Miss S applied for assistance March 22, 1957. She was 23. She said she had lived with the father of her children, Mr. E, for 3 years but that he had deserted and left town. She was told by the intake worker that she must make efforts to locate Mr. E and to support the children. She seemed reluctant to seek employment saying she did not think she could make enough money to support the children and arrange for their care. Referral was made to

IS by intake April 29, 1957, to locate Mr. E and on March 18, 1958, he was found by IS to be living in the District of Columbia. The record is not clear as to what action was taken in regard to Mr. E but there is no record of his having been seen. In July 1957 Mr. E bought a television set giving his wife's name as that of Miss S. According to a April 1, 1959, entry, Miss S has another television. This record indicates that re-referral should be made to locate Mr. E and also to determine access.

SHOULD BE REFERRED TO DETERMINE ACCESS—NO ACTION AFTER LOCATION

Case No. 53: Mrs. P has received assistance continuously since 1948. Her husband was drowned in August 1948. He was the father of two of her three children. Three more children have been born since 1948. On March 6, 1950, the worker learned that Mrs. P had given birth to a child on November 2, 1949. A visit had been made on September 4, 1949, but Mrs. P's pregnancy was not noticed or at least not mentioned. William H was the father of this child and of a child born in 1951. The grant continued with no discussion of the need to see Mr. H nor of Mrs. P's continued relationship with him. On June 29, 1953, the landlord told the agency that Mrs. P is planning to be married, that her boyfriend had "hit the numbers." On July 14, 1953, Mr. Joe W was in the office saying that he has no intention of marrying Mrs. P since he already has a wife. There was no discussion recorded of any continuing relationship. On January 20, 1954, a new baby is seen. Mrs. P named Joseph W as the father and said she did not tell the agency because her assistance would be stopped. The worker explained the need to talk to Mr. W and he came to the office January 25, 1954. He said he would support the baby. There was no discussion of a continuing relationship. On November 21, 1956, referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. H and Mr. W. Mr. W was located in District of Columbia jail in April 1947 and in July 1947 Mr. H was located in District of Columbia. Although located by I.S., Mr. H was never seen. Referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES REFERRED FOR ONE REASON BUT SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED FOR ANOTHER REASON—NO ACTION TAKEN AFTER LOCATED

Case No. 70: Miss W received assistance from 1947 until 1951 when an attorney called regarding arrangements to purchase a home by a Mr. T and Miss W who gave her name as Dorothy T. The case was closed because need could not be established. She reapplied for assistance July 24, 1951. Another child was born in December 1951 and she has received assistance continuously since that time. Mr. T died in October 1951. In July 1956, it was learned that she was pregnant by Mr. P. She said she had known him for 4 years and he had visited "as a regular friend for 1 year." Mr. P was seen on October 18, 1956. He said he had five children and a mother to support. He said he was not intimate with Miss W at present and did not "intend to have any more transactions with her." Miss W's mother is also receiving assistance and there is difficulty in verifying shelter costs and living arrangements. Miss W moves constantly and she and her mother live together and then apart. A man always rents the house for them. Referral to IS on January 25, 1957, was made by the previous worker to determine resources or roomers and to locate Mr. W. On August 29, 1958, Mr. W was located in the District of Columbia but no action was taken to get in touch with him. The fact that he was located was not mentioned in the dictation. This case should have been re-referred to IS to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY NOT CLEARLY ESTABLISHED

Case No. 56: Mrs. R made two applications in 1954, two in 1955, two in 1956, and one in 1957. Each of these applications were terminated because she had done nothing to get support from her paramour, John W, because Mr. W was able to work or absence of Mr. W from the home was not established. When she applied for the eighth time on February 13, 1958, she was again pregnant by Mr. W. She said he had not had regular work for several months so she asked him to leave the home. Emergency assistance was authorized. She said she had lived with Mr. W since 1953 and that he was the father of her two children and the unborn child. She said she and her husband separated in 1953 "because Mr. W was living in the home and he would not support all of them." Referral was made to I.S. March 10, 1958, to determine if Mr. W had access to the home. On April 29, 1958, I.S. reported no sign of a man at the time of visits. However, Mr. W gave Mrs. R's address as recently as February 28, 1958, when he was arrested for being drunk. IS suggested re-referral after 3 months but this was not done. Eligibility in this case was not clearly established. From Mrs. R's statements it would appear that either absence does not exist or, if Mr. W is absent, the separation is one of convenience for assistance purposes. Mrs. R appeared to be no more eligible at the time of the eighth application than when the previous seven applications were made. Since the case was accepted, re-referral should have been made to determine access.

SHOULD HAVE BEEN RE-REFERRED

Case No. 3: Mrs. B, age 24, applied for assistance in May 1956. She had four children by four different fathers. Referral to I.S. was made in September 1956 to locate the father of one of the children and to determine access. On November 20, 1956, I.S. reported they had located Mr. M. His address and employer were given. The case was closed in April 1957 after Mrs. B had given false information as to the whereabouts of two of her children. She reapplied May 2, 1957. She said she had never lived with any of the fathers of her children, although when one of them was seen on September 4, 1956, he said he had lived with Mrs. B for the past 2 years. Referral should have been made to I.S. at that time to determine access. Referral was made to determine access. This was done after the paternal grandmother of one of the children had telephoned to say that Mrs. B was living with a Mr. A, spending nights at his quarters and had a child by him this past summer. On October 9, 1958, I.S. reported two men in the home. On October 28, 1958, the investigators were admitted by the same man who had opened the door at the time of the previous visit. Mrs. B cursed violently and threw an object at the investigator. On February 19, 1959, I.S. reported that no men were seen in the apartment but that Mrs. B appears to have a new baby. On February 2, 1959, I.S. reported a baby was born September 16, 1958, and that the house was rented by Joseph A, whose place of employment showed his address as the same as Mrs. B's and who claimed a wife and two children for tax purposes.

On February 20, 1959, a letter was written to Mrs. B saying assistance could not be continued until her living arrangements were clarified. She was seen in February and March 1959. At first she denied having had a child and then said she had given the infant away on the hospital steps to a person whose name she did not know.

Form No. 122, dated February 25, 1959, said the grant continued unchanged as Mrs. B continued to deny the birth of the baby. A

check with Payroll Control revealed that the March 1, 1959, check was canceled. This case should have been re-referred for access at the time of reapplication in May 1957.

EXAMPLE OF CASE WHERE REFERRAL TO I.S. WAS JUSTIFIED—NO ACTION TAKEN ON INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY I.S.—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 204: When Mrs. B. applied for assistance on February 6, 1951, at the age of 20, she had one child and was pregnant. She said she only wanted assistance until her child was born and she can return to work. She said she had been separated from Mr. B. for 4 years. She named Mr. F. as the father of her child and said that Mr. Lloyd T. was the father of her unborn child. The case was closed in December 1951 when Mrs. B. obtained employment. She reapplied in July 1953 saying she was pregnant by Mr. Samuel T., who was the brother of the father of her last child. The application was terminated because Mrs. B. had made no effort to obtain support from the fathers of her children. When she reapplied in November 1953 she was again pregnant by Samuel T. Mrs. B. said she was really not sure who was the father of her oldest child. She went with Mr. F. and then became intimate with Mr. Lloyd T. Mr. Lloyd T. denied paternity and the court upheld this. He admitted paternity of the child born in 1951 and was under court order.

He had not paid regularly as he became angry with her when she began a relationship with his brother, Mr. Samuel T. Mrs. B. was told in November and December that it would be necessary for Mr. B., her husband, and Mr. Lloyd T., to contact the Agency. Mr. Lloyd T. telephoned on February 16, 1954 to say that he was making the payment ordered by the court but his payments were in arrears. "He doubted paternity to the child saying he had been caught and Mrs. B. did not know who actual father is." He said he is married and lived with his family and that his brother, Mr. Samuel T., is also "happily married". On December 17, 1954 Mrs. B. said that she was 7 months pregnant. She said that Mr. F. is also the father of this child. "It was decided that Mrs. B. would receive no further assistance until resource in Mr. F., putative father, was cleared and efforts to secure support from Mr. Samuel T. cleared." Mr. F., father of 2 of Mrs. B.'s children, was in the office on January 21, 1955. He said his relationship with Mrs. B. was "merely a passing fancy", and that "he considers her as a girl to take to one of the motels or out night clubbing." He said he has a family of his own. Later in the interview, he said he has a common-law wife with whom he has been in a close relationship since 1949 and with whom he spends the night whenever he desires. On April 12, 1955, Mr. Lloyd T. was in the office. He said he was under order to pay Mrs. B. \$6 a week. He said he has a wife and 4 children and that he and his wife had tried to help Mrs. B. in 1953 by keeping the children.

He said he and Mrs. B. were friends during schooldays. He planned at one time to marry her but decided against this because of her relationship with his brother. He said that "she will be intimate with any man that comes along. He states that he knows from her previous behavior that she will have another child next year if she meets another man. He has tried to talk to her about her relationship with so many men but it does not seem to help. He was her regular boyfriend for over 4 years." On May 18, 1955, Mr. B. was seen. He said he does not feel any responsibility toward Mrs. B., who left him in 1948 because he was unemployed. He is unable to obtain a divorce because of his religion but considers himself separated.

He said he is not willing to do anything for Mrs. B. "because of her unfaithfulness and being a person no one can trust". He saw Mrs. B. 2 weeks ago and there was a boyfriend in the home at that time.

He said another reason he is not willing to help Mrs. B. was because she had her boyfriend forge his name to a loan. He said he had tried to live with Mrs. B. and make a go of it but it seemed to be impossible. He gave his address. In an interview in September 1955, Mrs. B. said she had "no male interests as she is disgusted with men." She said she was not pregnant. On October 21, 1955, a report was received from Mrs. B.'s landlady that she was pregnant. Mrs. B. was reported to have said that she had denied her pregnancy to her worker and had "decided what she would say when her pregnancy is discovered by her worker". On October 26 she denied that she was pregnant. On November 23, 1955, she admitted her pregnancy and said that Mr. F., whose address she gave, is the father of her expected child. (This is Mrs. B.'s third child by Mr. F., who told the Agency on January 21, 1955, that his relationship with Mrs. B. was "merely a passing fancy.") On November 25, 1955, Mrs. B. and Mr. F. were seen.

Mr. F. said he could not support two families. They were informed that no further assistance could be issued. Mrs. B. appealed and a hearing was arranged on January 5, 1956. The action of the Agency was sustained. On December 30, 1955, referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. F. was absent from the home. On January 5, 1956, a five-page report was received from I.S. saying that the relationship continues. The I.S. report expressed the opinion that Mrs. B. was untruthful but has the ability of creating the impression that she is telling the truth. The case was closed in January 1956. She reapplied in July 1956 for herself and six children. She said that she was evicted and four of her children were placed in Junior Village. She has been working and continued to work at the Willard Hotel. On August 28, 1956 a telephone call was received from a CWD worker who said that Mrs. B.'s case was new to the Agency but had been known to CWD for sometime. Child Welfare Division recommended that the mother give up her work and apply for assistance so that she could make a home for the children. The CWD worker said later that the case had been known to the Agency and the case had been closed "because of policy 7 but that all of this had been taken care of and the mother had gone to court with all of the fathers available and bench warrants had been issued for the rest of them and that her Agency was aware of the circumstances and knew that there was no continuing relationship between the mother and any of the four fathers involved." In an interview with Mrs. B. August 30, 1956, she said she was not having any relations with the fathers of her children. She talked in length about her church attendance, the teachings of the Holy Bible and her plans "to make a change in her life."

The Agency policy concerning absence was discussed and she said she understood it fully. She said she did not want to reapply for assistance but was told by CWD that she must do this. On February 1, 1957, she said "I wish I could place these children somewhere so I wouldn't have to be bothered with them. You just don't know how tiresome it is to have to stay at home with these children all the time and not be able to get out." Mrs. B. mentioned a soldier stationed at Fort Belvoir in whom she is interested. On March 3, 1958, the worker discussed with Mrs. B. a report which had been received that she was pregnant. Agency policy was again discussed and she said she was fully aware of

it. She emphatically denied that she was pregnant. On March 17, 1958, form 29 was received saying that Mrs. B. had had an incomplete abortion.

This case was carried by the worker in case-load 223 from September 1958 to February 1959. On September 22, 1958 referral was made to I.S. to determine if Mr. B., or any of the fathers, or any men had access. On October 6, 1958, a report was received that Mrs. B. may be pregnant and on November 17, 1958 I.S. reported that a Mr. K. was found in the home and that Mr. B. came in while the investigators were there. No action was taken on this report. On April 29, 1959, a letter was received from Mrs. K. saying that her husband is keeping company with Mrs. B. On May 12, 1959, I.S. reported a report had been received that Mr. K. lives in Mrs. B.'s home as her paramour. On May 29, 1959, rereferral was made to I.S. by the present worker to establish whether a husband-and-wife relationship exists between Mrs. B. and Mr. K. and whether he has free access to her home.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED—NO ACTION TAKEN ON I.S. INFORMATION

Case No. 232: This case was carried by the worker from July 1958 to February 1959. Mrs. R. applied in April 1950 for herself and one child. She said her common-law husband had died in March. She worked as an elevator operator for 5 years and employment was discussed in 1954 and 1956. In February 1956 she said she had a "steady boyfriend, Francis A." She said he had been her boyfriend for the past 3 years. In November 1956 Mr. A. said he had stopped seeing Mrs. R. In September 1957 Mrs. R. said she was no longer seeing Mr. A. Referral to I.S. was made in September 1958 to determine access. On October 17, 1958, I.S. found Mr. A. in the home. On November 13, 1958, I.S. reported Mrs. R. said she had not seen Mr. A. since November 3, 1958. The record shows no discussion with Mrs. R. of I.S. report and no action taken.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 229: Miss P. applied in August 1954 when she was 18 years of age. Prior to her 18th birthday, she had been included in her mother's grant. She had one child and was pregnant. The father of her 3-year-old child was James J. She gave the father of her unborn child as William B., an ATD recipient. In February 1955 she said her relationship with Mr. B continued and would continue. Her pregnancy was described by her as just "one of those things." In April 1955 Miss P.'s mother complained of her neglect of the children. She sometimes stayed out all night and left the baby all day without food. In April 1955 Mr. B. was seen. He also said his relationship with Miss P. was a continuing one. In May 1955 another man, a barber, rented an apartment for Miss P. In January 1956 she said her relationship with Mr. B. continued and she is again pregnant. In February 1956 Mr. B. used the same expression Miss P. had used in describing her pregnancy—"it was just one of those things." Mr. B. died in July 1956. In September 1956 referral was made to I.S. by the previous worker to locate Mr. J., father of Miss P.'s oldest child. I.S. located him and he was interviewed in October 1956. He said he loved Miss P. and wanted to marry her but her mother does not want him to. He said he did not think Miss P. is a decent mother. He said she drinks. He told of seeing her on 4th Street SW. at 1:30 a.m. He said he would like to have the children. She told Mr. J. she was planning to be married but she denied this in an interview dated October 29, 1956. She had on a "set of wedding rings" which she said came from

the 10-cent store. She giggled over this. In June 1957 Miss P. was again pregnant, this time by a Carl S. On August 13, 1958, referral was made to I.S. because of an anonymous complaint of neglect. I.S. was also asked to identify any man involved and to locate Mr. S. On September 4, 1958, a partial report from I.S. told of serious neglect of the children. They were found alone on four night visits. There was no further report from I.S. in the record and no current dictation.

REFERRAL JUSTIFIED

Case No. 224: Mr. and Mrs. M. applied in January 1958. The application was terminated because Mr. M. was employable. She reapplied in September 1958. Referral was made to I.S. to locate Mr. M. and to ascertain if Mrs. M. is seeing any man other than her husband. This referral was made because of reports that Mrs. M. was having relations with other men. In May, I.S. found a man hiding under the bed and located Mr. M. The check for June 1959 was held.

CASE REFERRED WHICH SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN REFERRED—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 208: According to the entry on form No. 246, dated August 15, 1958, Mrs. C. said she had been separated from her husband for a year. On September 8, 1958, she said she had been assisted by John M. who had advanced \$240 toward her divorce. She was told that the agency would have to talk with Mr. M. since the conversation indicated they were cohabitating and that she was not eligible because of her continuing relationship with Mr. M. She promised to have Mr. M. get in touch with the agency but he failed to do this. The grant was authorized and continued in spite of Mrs. C.'s admitted relationship with Mr. M. Referral to I.S. was made in November 1958 to locate Mr. C. and to determine access of Mr. M. Referral did not appear to be justified because no effort had been made by Mrs. C. or the agency to locate Mr. C., and because Mrs. C. had admitted her relationship with Mr. M. Eligibility was questioned for the above reasons and also because there was no medical report to indicate the need for Mrs. C. to stay at home and care for the child she said was not enjoying good health.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED

Case No. 237: Mrs. S. applied November 6, 1952, for herself and two children, saying she was not able to make child-care arrangements. She said she had been divorced from Mr. S. for 14 years and for the past 6 years had lived with Mr. C., the father of her youngest child. The father of the older child was dead. She asked for assistance until she could make child-care arrangements. She had worked as a domestic for the past 6 years. The worker talked with Mr. C. by telephone who said he was fond of Mrs. S. and would be willing for her to return and to continue his relationship with her but he could not get along with her. In August 1954 Mrs. S. was offered a job as headwaitress at the Cosmos Club, but could not accept it because she said she had no child-care plan. In January 1957 Mr. C. was again contacted by telephone and said he had no continuing relationship with Mrs. S. In May 1957 a television was seen which Mrs. S. said had been given to her by John P., a casual friend. There is no indication as to how long this record was carried by the worker whose caseload was under study.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE

Case No. 212: Mrs. F., age 19, applied in December 1956. Mr. F. was in jail for non-support. She said they had been separated before he was sentenced. Mr. F. was seen in August 1957 and said he planned a divorce

from Mrs. F., who left him in June 1955. Mrs. F. had a child by another man. Mrs. F. admitted this and said the father was James M. She gave Mr. M.'s address and employer and said his mother was going to take the baby. In August 1957 she said she did not want to take Mr. M. to court. She said she was working evenings for her uncle and her mother was looking after the children. (On January 9, 1957, Mrs. F. had said she had no relatives other than an aunt.) The case was closed in 1957 because Mrs. F. refused to take Mr. M. to court. She reapplied in December 1957 saying she was willing to go to court and was not continuing her relationship with Mr. M. A baby was born on September 21, 1958. She said the father was Emanuel D. and she had no idea where he was. Referral was made to I.S. in May 1958 by a previous worker to locate Mr. F. On December 17, 1958, Mrs. F. said Mr. F. lives with her mother. On January 6, 1959, referral was made by the subsequent worker to locate Mr. D. Referral should have been made to determine access. There is nothing to indicate how long this case was carried by the worker whose caseload is under study. Child-care arrangement seemed available.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—CHILD-CARE PLAN SEEMED AVAILABLE

Case No. 219: Mrs. J., age 22, pregnant, applied in July 1956 for herself and two children. Mr. J. has not supported and she has been to J.C. The father of the oldest child was George H. In August 1956, Mrs. J.'s mother telephoned to say that one of the children was with her and another one with the paternal grandmother. On August 21, 1956, Mrs. J. said she had not seen Mr. J. since July 1956. On August 29, 1956, the landlady told the worker that Mr. J. was living in the apartment with Mrs. J. and that he was there at the time of the worker's last visit but was hiding in the bathroom. On September 4 the landlady said various men and women frequent the apartment and stay until 4 or 5 a.m. She thinks they "rent out the bed." Later, Mrs. J. said that Mr. J. was not there but had "been coming to see her almost every day." "She was told we would have to see Mr. J. and that he 'will have to prove his absence before another check can be issued.'" In September and October 1956, the landlady telephoned to say that Mr. J. was in the home. In June 1957, Mr. J. was sentenced to 8 years on a narcotics charge—release date March 1963.

This case was carried by the worker whose caseload was reviewed, from June 1958 to February 1959. Referral should have been made to locate the father of the oldest child and, in view of Mrs. J.'s past behavior, referral should have been made to determine access.

CASES WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—HUSBAND NOT CONTACTED ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—NO EFFORT BY MOTHER TO LOCATE FATHER

Case No. 241: Mrs. Y., age 21, applied in April 1956. She said Mr. Y. had left the home 3 days ago. The application was terminated because she had not made sufficient effort to locate him. She reapplied in January 1957 saying Mr. Y. had deserted. He is not the father of either of her children. The father of the oldest child was James M., whose address she gave. The father of the younger child is Robert L., who is believed to be living with his mother. Mrs. Y. failed to keep her appointment and the application was terminated. She reapplied in November 1957. The dictation under date of January 30, 1958, says, "Once again 15 or 20 men were lounging in various rooms on the first floor." A 21-inch television was seen which she said her husband had purchased. On March 24, 1958, referral was made to Investi-

gation Service to locate Mr. L. and Mr. M. On May 13, 1958, Investigation Service reported Robert S., a "cousin" in the home. The address he gave proved to be fictitious. The length of time this record was carried by the worker could not be determined. The March 1958 referral was not made by him. Referral should have been made to determine access. It is also noted that no effort was made to locate Mr. Y., whose address was known and Mrs. Y. made no effort to locate him or the fathers of her children.

CASE WHICH SHOULD HAVE BEEN REFERRED—FATHER NOT SEEN ALTHOUGH ADDRESS KNOWN—CHILD CARE PLAN SEEMS AVAILABLE—ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONED

Case No. 240: When Miss W. applied for assistance August 1, 1957, she had one child and was pregnant. She said she had been employed until July 1957 when her employer moved out of town. According to the information on form No. 108 she had done day work from 1953 to 1956, had worked as a maid in a hotel from March 1956 to February 1957 and worked as a nursemaid from March 1957 until July 1957. She said she felt she would need assistance until around November 1957 when her coming baby would be approximately 2 months old. There is no discussion in the record as to the child-care arrangement she made for her child born in 1954 when previously employed.

Miss W. said that Percy D. was the father of her unborn child. She gave his address and said he was employed at the Soldiers' Home. She said Espoy T. was the father of Barbara, born in 1954. She gave his address and was referred to J.C. An entry dated January 22, 1958, says that form No. 241 was received, saying that Mr. T. had not supported within the past year, that the child was beyond the age limit and therefore the case was not accepted. Miss W. was asked to contact Mr. T. and to have him come to the agency. She was also advised to bring Mr. D. to the agency. Mr. D. telephoned April 3, 1958, making an appointment for April 5, 1958, which he did not keep.

On March 24, 1958, the worker records: "During the interview I asked Miss W. what she had done to return to work since she indicated at the time of her application she only wanted assistance for such time as to have her baby and then return to work. She seemed very much taken back by this and it was obvious that she had not considered this at all. I explained to her that we considered employability as a potential resource. She stated that she has felt that perhaps she could make a child-care plan and then go back to work. She was asked to advise me of this."

In an entry dated July 24, 1958, it was reported that Mr. D. had said he lived with Miss W. in the NCHA project. They were both given an appointment for July 30, 1958, but Mr. D. failed to come. She was told July 24, 1958, that the August check could not be mailed until we talked with them. She was told on July 30, 1958, that we need to discuss with Mr. D. plans for their child as well as their plan regarding their relationship. On August 9, 1958, Miss W. and Mr. D. were in the office by appointment. He said he was under court order to pay \$12 a week for the support of his child. The only recorded discussion regarding his relationship with Miss W. is as follows: "No relation with Miss W." The last entry in the record was dated October 13, 1958. It was suggested that Miss W. take some action toward seeking employment. "Miss W. stated that she would begin to look for work after she received her 11-1 check." The worker pointed out that she would be expected to resume work as soon as possible and to work out a child-care plan. "It was further pointed out that living in the project where

there were so many mothers, it should not be hard to get someone to look after the children while she is employed."

The entry dated October 13, 1958, says the case was transferred to the worker in C.T. 73.5. There is no dictation since that date. The last authorization is from December 1, 1958 to October 31, 1959.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point tables which indicate the growth of the population at Junior Village for the fiscal years 1956-62.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

Admissions, discharges, and average daily population at Junior Village, fiscal years 1956 and 1957

	1956	1957
Admissions.....	742	872
Discharges.....	768	778
Daily average population.....	240	272

Population at Junior Village, fiscal years 1958-62

Item	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962
Admissions.....	936	1,103	1,137	1,130	1,110
Discharges.....	932	1,056	1,037	1,101	1,004
Total under care end of year.....	317	364	464	493	599

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the population for 1952 was 130; for 1953, was 146; for 1954, was 192; and for 1955, was 225.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD testimony from the hearings indicating the savings for the Welfare Department which were brought about in fiscal year 1963 as a result of the work of the Office of Investigations and Collections.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVINGS FOR WELFARE DEPARTMENT

Senator BYRD. Now, Mr. Galvin, how much have you saved for the Department during fiscal year 1963 including grant deductions, and collections, and I am speaking of local money only.

Mr. GALVIN. I have computed that once, but with the new figures, I will have to do it again.

Senator BYRD. All right. Would you like for us to go on and then come back to this later.

Mr. GALVIN. Fine.

Senator BYRD. Then we will pass that over and come back to it.

Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. GALVIN. I have that. It would be between, and I will explain the reason for these two figures, \$1,786,621 and \$2,478,241.

Now, the way we estimate the \$2,478,241 is as follows: we have \$558,096 savings from differences in grants resulting from new investigation programs.

We get that estimate by taking the total difference in grants in intake, EPA audit and the AFDC audit closed cases and multiply it by 12 for the year, for annualization, by the difference in collections over last year of \$43,041, by reduction in grants reflected in last year's alternate budget, of \$1,637,807; unused OIC funds including transfers of \$89,427; and unused grant money for fiscal year 1963 of \$149,870; this figure was supplied to me by Mr. Cohen.

And then we have to assume, since I don't have the figures on the difference in grants in closed cases of complaints and locations sections, that they would be the same as last year.

Mr. Lajewski said, when I talked to him about it, that he has submitted a report for last year but I have not received it yet.

So, this would total up to \$2,478,241.

METHOD OF ARRIVING AT SMALLER SUM

The way that we get the smaller figure of \$1,786,621 is:

Instead of annualizing the difference in grants for the three programs, since they started in January and they went through June, we multiplied by 3 instead of 12 and came up with the figure of \$139,524. We use a smaller figure in collections, taking into consideration that last year we had a one-time collection of a bond transfer in the DTS trust fund and we add the bonds to last year's collection and using this figure we have a deficit of \$5,404. We take out from reductions in grants for fiscal year 1963, \$224,603, which was the increase in the OA, AB, and ATD of \$4.20 per case. This leaves grant reductions as \$1,413,204. There is no change in the other savings previously given. With these changes, we come up with \$1,786,621.

Senator BYRD. You are speaking of local moneys only?

Mr. GALVIN. Local moneys only.

OVERALL LOCAL FUNDS SAVINGS

Senator BYRD. Would you like to submit for the record a statement as to the overall savings?

Mr. GALVIN. I would like to do that.

Senator BYRD. Locally, I mean.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes; because I have done this calculation very rapidly, and I would like to be sure that the figures are accurate.

Senator BYRD. Yes, sir; and why don't you do that and give us a statement?

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

Senator BYRD. That will show the savings locally, and you may add footnotes if you care to.

Mr. GALVIN. Yes, sir.

(The statement referred to follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS AND COLLECTIONS,

September 30, 1963.

Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia

District agency and/or program	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Year of origin
1. Public schools:						
(a) Veterans.....	\$2,380	\$7,771	\$7,771	\$5,220	\$4,745	1959
(b) Vocational education (George Barden).....	126,027	129,814	138,653	130,481	120,338	(1)
(c) National defense education.....	37,361	234,767	201,401	221,563	136,182	1959
(d) Civilian defense adult education.....				7,603	31,112	1962
(e) Capitol Page School.....	61,915	62,500	64,100	67,900	68,365	(2)
Total, public schools.....	227,683	434,852	411,925	432,767	360,742	

See footnotes at end of table.

Overall savings in local money resulting from OIC operations

	Maximum savings	Minimum savings
From unused OIC budget funds.....	¹ \$24,427	¹ \$24,427
From transfers out of OIC budget funds.....	65,000	65,000
Unused grants.....	59,870	59,870
Grants transferred out.....	90,000	90,000
Reduction in grants, fiscal year 1963.....	1,637,807	² 1,413,204
Difference in grants resulting from new investigation programs.....	³ 558,096	³ 139,524
From collections.....	43,041	⁴ (5,404)
Total savings.....	2,478,241	1,786,621

¹ Schedule A.

² See the following:

Reduction in grants, fiscal year 1964... \$1,637,807
Increase of \$4.20 per case (OA, AB, ATD)..... 224,603

Total..... 1,413,204

³ Schedule B.

⁴ See the following:

Increase in collections, fiscal year 1963 over fiscal year 1962..... 43,041
Deduct one-time DTS fund collection, fiscal year 1962..... 48,445

Total..... (5,404)

NOTE.—No figures available as yet on results of investigations of complaints referrals or locations for fiscal year 1962 or fiscal year 1963. We assume the differences in grants are the same.

WILLIAM R. GALVIN,

Investigations and Collections Officer.

Savings, OIC, fiscal year 1963

SCHEDULE A	
Appropriated by Congress.....	\$500,000
Transferred in.....	15,706
Total.....	515,706
Transferred out to FAO.....	27,846
Total.....	487,860
Transferred out.....	65,000
Total.....	422,860
Expended.....	398,433
Unused OIC budget funds.....	24,427

Total difference in grants per month

SCHEDULE B	
OIC program:	
Intake review.....	\$22,793
GPA audit review.....	22,638
AFDC audit review.....	1,077
Total.....	46,508
Annualized.....	558,096
Approximate average, January-June 1963.....	139,524

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a table of Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia for the years 1959 through 1963.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia—Continued

District agency and/or program	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	Year of origin
2. Public health:						
(a) Tuberculosis control	36,280	37,101	37,405	32,948	30,863	1945
(b) Cancer control	9,740	9,657	26,022	26,354	26,514	1948
(c) Mental health control	25,871	40,981	41,021	66,507	66,796	1948
(d) Mental health planning					50,000	1963
(e) General health	51,209	51,046	57,163	42,603	42,105	1936
(f) Chronically ill				40,000	65,899	1962
(g) Maternal and child health	256,114	229,618	241,713	321,539	289,795	1942
(h) Crippled children	184,357	198,402	241,217	291,840	263,656	1942
(i) Venereal disease	77,746	54,817	46,127	45,240	60,824	1950
(j) Hospital construction		369,580	25,920			1948
(k) Water pollution	24,188	24,081	26,403	39,731	35,750	1950
(l) Heart disease	16,597	32,779	34,181	47,041	69,115	1950
(m) Tuberculosis control project					22,107	1963
(n) Mouth guard program					4,000	1963
(o) Physical therapy demonstration					19,262	1963
(p) Psychological training					9,270	1962
(q) Mental health		55,000	55,000	55,000		1960
(r) Old age assistance, medical care			31,550	126,267	158,567	1961
(s) Medical assistance for the aged					37,725	1963
Total, public health	682,162	1,103,062	863,722	1,135,160	1,252,248	
3. Public welfare:						
(a) Old age assistance	\$1,736,041	\$1,552,301	\$1,716,236	\$1,956,976	\$1,995,642	1936
(b) Aid to families with dependent children	4,133,073	4,839,759	6,091,602	6,716,427	5,190,348	1936
(c) Aid to the blind	116,143	122,011	121,088	102,368	144,203	1936
(d) Aid to the permanently and totally disabled	1,276,712	1,381,304	1,539,763	1,494,862	1,803,672	1950
(e) Medical assistance for the aged					100,000	1963
(f) Assistance to repatriates			196	4,575	1,550	1961
(g) Aid to Cuban refugees				1,573	19,141	1962
Total, public welfare	7,261,969	7,895,375	9,468,885	10,276,781	9,254,556	
4. Vocational rehabilitation:						
(a) Support of vocational rehabilitation services	235,974	229,328	227,958	223,802	303,535	1954
(b) Residential training project			20,600	22,463	56,270	1961
(c) Disability determinations (OASI)	54,373	55,081	71,785	90,102	103,960	1955
(d) Study of closed cases			3,750			1961
(e) Study of fiscal accounting and statistical methods of operation				2,625		1962
(f) Implementation of fiscal accounting study					1,942	1962
(g) Publicity and information program					4,500	1963
(h) Employee development program				4,000	5,833	1961
Total, vocational rehabilitation	290,347	284,409	324,093	342,992	476,040	
5. Highways and traffic:						
(a) Primary, secondary, and urban highways	7,525,158	5,303,515	5,057,506	4,520,198	4,876,206	1938
(b) Interstate System	13,687,500	24,651,125	17,659,620	21,461,344	34,412,400	1957
Total, highways and traffic	21,212,658	29,954,640	22,717,126	25,981,542	39,288,606	
6. Civil defense:						
(a) Personnel and administration			21,458	68,355	76,108	1961
(b) Equipment	32,153	4,971		15,317	5,404	1952
Total, civil defense	32,153	4,971	21,458	83,672	81,512	
7. Sanitary engineering:						
(a) Waste treatment works construction	249,200	332,046	384,579	117,447	606,295	1956
(b) Potomac interceptor system			2,700,000		300,000	1961
Total, sanitary engineering	249,200	332,046	3,084,579	117,447	906,295	
8. Juvenile delinquency control					100,767	1963
9. Downtown internal transit circulation study					32,000	1963
10. White House Conference on Aging		30,000				1960
11. Manpower development and training					816,944	1963
12. Urban renewal:						
(a) Community renewal program					101,660	1963
(b) Adams-Morgan 314 demonstration project	50,000	44,663	8,273	9,672	5,000	1959
Subtotal, urban renewal	50,000	44,663	8,273	9,672	106,660	
Relocation grant (amounts drawn by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency from HHFA) ¹	351,298	178,983	221,844	195,472	49,072	1958
Federal capital grant (amounts drawn by District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency against Federal $\frac{1}{4}$ share of net project costs) ²	10,527,507	517,768	1,158,950	4,153,342	2,128,000	1955
Total, urban renewal	10,928,805	741,415	1,389,066	4,358,486	2,283,732	
Grand total	40,884,977	40,780,770	38,280,854	42,728,847	54,853,442	

¹ Prior to 1940.² Prior to 1949.³ The relocation grant is made directly to RLA to offset expenses incurred in relocating families displaced by urban renewal action.⁴ There are 5 urban renewal projects in execution in the District of Columbia (south-west area B, southwest area C, southwest area C-1, Columbia Plaza, northeast, 1). The Federal Government is responsible by contract for $\frac{3}{4}$ of the new project costs of the local urban renewal program. The amounts shown above are advances made by NNFA to RLA against this $\frac{3}{4}$ obligation. These amounts received will be subtracted from the $\frac{3}{4}$ net project costs at project completion.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The committee wishes to express, however inadequate this form may be, its deep appreciation to the various governmental agencies throughout the State, including judges, prosecutors, probation departments, county and municipal welfare directors and their respective staffs, for their unstinted cooperation and deep sympathetic understanding of the problems of the unfortunate and the objectives of the committee.

The cooperation of the staff of investigators assigned by and under the direction of Maj. Francis W. Halley, Division of C.I.S.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a legislative report on the aid to dependent children program in New Jersey.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REPORT ON THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY
THE AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN PROGRAM IN NEW JERSEY

A report on the administration of the aid to dependent children program in New Jersey

by the Welfare Investigating Committee of the New Jersey Legislature constituted pursuant to senate concurrent resolution No. 25, laws of 1959; reconstituted under senate concurrent resolution No. 5, laws of 1960, and senate concurrent resolution No. 1, laws of 1962.

Senator ANTHONY J. GROSSI,
Chairman.

Senator CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR.,
Senator RICHARD R. STOUT,
Assemblyman MAURICE V. BRADY,
GROVER C. RICHMAN,

LEONARD A. COYLE,

Counsel.

Secretary.

of the State police deserves especial commendation.

His staff, under the supervision of Lt. L. J. Wert proved to be dedicated, highly skilled, and courteous often under trying conditions.

The committee is aware that without the teamwork displayed by our office staff, the State house stenographers, and the private investigators, its task would have been almost hopeless.

We wish to express our gratitude also to the citizens and the newspapers of New Jersey. It was their collective wrath, following committee disclosures that forced changes in administration at the New Lisbon Colony for the mentally retarded.

Subsequently it was the support of the public and the press that assured the passage of the institutions and agencies bond referendum, which is making it possible to rebuild and revamp the New Lisbon Colony, already underway.

The committee also considers itself fortunate in having as counsel the distinguished former attorney general of New Jersey, the Honorable Grover C. Richman who developed most of the testimony adduced before the committee.

As to Leonard Coyle, the secretary to the committee, we will let this report stand as a testimonial to his painstaking research and assistance in putting this document together.

To our fellow members of the New Jersey Legislature, we feel a deep and profound gratitude for their confidence in our prior work which they expressed by their unanimous vote in the passage of the 12 bills introduced by the committee as a result of its hearings and recommendations.

Our sentiments are probably best expressed by an excerpt from an editorial in the Bergen Evening Record in May 1962 that the legislature, "was responsible for as fine a set of reform bills as the State has seen in years."

Finally, we would be remiss if we didn't recognize the contribution to society by Gov. Richard J. Hughes who readily approved appropriations for the committee, and who displayed a deep sense of social awareness by his prompt signature to the bills.

THE COMMITTEE.

"The lessons of history * * * show conclusively that continued dependency upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief * * * is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit * * *. The Federal Government must and shall quit this business of relief."—FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, 1935.

FOREWORD

As sympathetic as the President was to the needs of the poor and needy, he was also keenly aware that we must not ignore the lessons of history and the facts of the present day.

With this thought in mind the committee submits its last and final report on welfare in New Jersey. Two interim reports have already been submitted to the legislature; the first on child welfare in New Jersey; the second on the State colony at New Lisbon for feeble-minded males.

This report deals with New Jersey's aid to dependent children program, formerly known as home life assistance. More familiarly known as ADC, its purpose is to assist needy children who have been deprived of parental support through cash assistance and services designed to maintain and strengthen the family life and unity of the children involved.

This committee was created because of the ever-increasing burden upon the taxpayers who are called upon to support this program. By far ADC is the largest and most expensive public assistance program in New Jersey, ac-

counting for almost half of all relief expenditures annually.

We have always accepted as a public responsibility the ever-increasing costs of providing for the needs of families who for reasons, often beyond their control, must look to the public for help and assistance. But in the light of almost daily reports of flagrant and wanton abuses in our ADC program, public acceptance of it has been replaced by public indignation. Editors and journalists, clergymen and police officials, responsible people from all walks of life, our courts, judges, and grand juries have presented indictments of our ADC program, often pinpointing revolting abuses shocking the public conscience. These abuses have subverted the legitimate objectives of ADC. They cannot be ignored. The problem goes deeper than dollars. It affects the lives of innocent children often blighting their entire future by depriving them of their heritage and right to live in surroundings free from great moral harm and risks.

Many ADC families are living in hovels where mothers maintain illicit relationships with men of shadowy existence. They begot illegitimate child after child without remorse or apparent guilt.

The purpose of ADC is the humanitarian goal of helping needy children and their mothers maintain a safe and protected home environment. This committee does not question the humanitarian purposes of ADC. But we must question the continued amoral existence of many ADC recipients. The committee has approached the task of appraising our ADC program objectively, but keenly aware of its complexities. We have sought to discover the cause of the ever-increasing burden of relief expenditures with a view toward strengthening existing services while eliminating those found unnecessary.

Nearly 70 percent of all cases receiving aid through ADC were occasioned by deserting fathers, and mothers with illegitimate children. Much of the committee's investigations focused on these two causes, and it is apparent that if we are ever to reduce child dependency in New Jersey, more emphasis must be given to the prevention and elimination of the basic causes of family breakdown which give rise to desertions and illegitimacy.

The fact that many cases enumerated in this report highlight circumstances of immorality, and sometimes flagrant fraud, should not be construed as a condemnation of the ADC program. We propose this report serve as a guide in isolating such practices with a view toward their prevention in the future.

Senator ANTHONY J. GROSSI
(For the Committee).

A HISTORY

The care of the poor and the impoverished was recognized by New Jersey as a public obligation during its early days of settlement while under the colonial rule of England. Shortly after the initial settlement of New Jersey the influence of the English became predominant, with a preponderately English population carrying with it the customs, institutions and laws of the English people. Thus, the foundations of relief as known in New Jersey today derived from the early Elizabethan poor laws which developed in the year 1601.¹

Though primitive in concept the first Elizabethan poor law represented a radical departure from the previous concepts of individual relief, in that it recognized as a public responsibility, the care of the poor by government, paid out of public funds.

The administration of these early programs was left to the local governments with relief given only to those in dire need after all

other sources of personal and private aid were exhausted. This meant that all such persons were required to meet a means test as a prerequisite to the receipt of public aid.

Much of the prevailing attitude and philosophy of today's public relief programs are carryovers from this original concept of public relief by government first initiated in England under the Elizabethan poor laws and later adopted in the colonial period of New Jersey. Even today, a means test is required for most public aid.

From the earliest times, assistance programs were dominated by a desire to discourage any disposition to look to the government for support. Public relief was made less attractive by providing a standard of subsistence lower than the lowest standard of living in the community. Every effort was made to confine public relief to the smallest area possible, its primary objective being the repression of poverty.

The earliest legislation relating to public poor relief was passed in New Jersey in 1681 providing for the care of orphans at public expense.² In 1704, the legislature allocated certain fines for the care of the poor, but the most important relief legislation did not pass until 1709 when the legislature provided that every township select overseers of the poor and poor assessors. The overseers had direct responsibility for the care of the town poor while the assessors levied the necessary poor rate leaving its responsibility of collection to the overseer of the poor. This early legislation required the overseer "to take care that all poor were supplied with necessary maintenance and not suffered to wander abroad."³

As far back as 1666 there was fear expressed concerning the influx of strangers from outside the community who would eventually require public relief, and measures were taken to guard against this eventuality.⁴

During the 18th century aid to the poor was supplied in their own homes or foster homes. This type of assistance gradually became the principal form of relief in New Jersey.

The belief that able-bodied pauperism resulted from individual laziness and indolence attributed to an intermingling of penology with poor relief. While the aged and the needy young or the victims of disease or sickness received assistance in their own homes, the vagrant or beggar was often confined in a jail or workhouse for short periods of time, after which they were ordered out of town. While institutional confinement was restricted to this one class of people, as the population increased, the number of indigents increased proportionally giving rise to the construction and maintenance of public institutions for the care of the poor.

In lieu of institutional care, dependent children were often indentured out extending until the child was 18 years old. The person to whom the child was indentured had responsibility for the child's care and elementary educational training. If the child could work the person caring for him would profit from his labor.

Toward the middle of the 18th century the increased number of poor in the various towns created the need for more comprehensive legislative regulation. In particular, the problem of legal settlement had become especially troublesome. Whenever a needy person failed to meet settlement requirements in a local municipality he was often banished or ejected from the community. On returning to the town of his previous

¹ A. Leaming and J. Spicer "The Grants, Concessions and Original Constitutions of the Province of New Jersey, 1758."

² Ibid., p. 8.

³ "Records of the Town of Newark, 1666 to 1836."

⁴ 43 Elizabeth I L. 3.

residence, the banished pauper often found he had lost his settlement there. Soon, there became a growing number of unsettled poor roaming the State. Thus the present day statutory requirements concerning legal settlement of the poor was initially created by the legislature in 1740 and provided for a series of conditions which constituted legal settlement in any town or municipality.⁵ Generally, settlement included natives of a town or people who had lived for at least 1 year's residence in the town on land owned or leased, or had worked or served an apprenticeship for at least 1 year. Other conditions included family residence in the town for a year, the holding of a public office for a year, or the payment of the tax for poor relief for 1 year. This legislation was the first in a series of similar legislation designed to provide a uniform settlement requirement of 1 year's residence for all individuals except native born citizens.

The original act of 1740 also required that any destitute person failing to meet the requirements of legal settlement when in need of public assistance, or upon application for public assistance was required to return to the town of his legal settlement either on a voluntary basis or by action of the town constable. However, legislation could not possibly cover all types of administrative questions affecting settlement in individual cases. In 1758, after noting the many failures of the 1740 statute, the legislature reenacted its provisions, adding the requirement that all persons coming to reside in any municipality must give notice to the overseers of the poor within 10 days.⁶ This applied to any persons bringing in apprentices or indentured servants. If any persons were likely to become public charges before obtaining legal settlement, they were to be returned to the place of their last legal settlement.

More extensive regulation of local relief practices were included in the comprehensive poor relief act of 1774.⁷ This provided for a broad statutory framework for a slowly expanding system of poor relief. Overseers, not exceeding four in number, were to be chosen at town meetings to be placed in charge of town relief activities. Parents, grandparents, children, and grandchildren severally and individually of all poor persons were held responsible for their care, and the overseer was required to exhaust these resources before granting an individual public relief. In addition to other sections affecting legal settlement, the act incorporated the first permissive legislation for the building of almshouses by municipalities to care for their poor.

Despite these early attempts to provide for the poor, their numbers continued to grow. At the end of the 18th century, the foundations of public assistance in New Jersey were firmly established by local usage and general law. Care of the destitute was fully recognized as a public obligation. As a function of government, it was financed and administered by the localities.⁸ This period evidenced the first tendency to separate the operation of jails and workhouses from the poor relief administration and in the Workhouse Act of 1799 legislative groundwork was laid for the administration of penal institutions separate and apart from the poor laws.⁹ Outdoor relief—the boarding of the

poor in private homes by individual contract, or the indenture of neglected or orphaned children—had become the prevailing method of public assistance. The building of institutional almshouses to care for the poor in each municipality failed to achieve any measurable effect principally because the costs of construction and maintenance of such institutions was beyond the financial ability of most municipalities.

In 1798, the legislature granted authority to the counties individually or jointly to build county poorhouses. Here, a county which established a poorhouse was required to commit the poor in the various towns to that institution to maintain them there at county expense.¹⁰ The costs for the maintenance of the institution were to be financed out of general county taxes. Thus the way was open for the transfer of public responsibility of the poor from the town and municipality to the county. Almshouse care became the prevailing method of poor relief in "the more populous areas of the State where a large volume of relief services were required. However, in rural areas, the towns either sent their destitute to a county almshouse, a nearby municipal almshouse, or cared for them by the traditional method of outdoor relief. Though the almshouse became the principal medium of relief, it was still necessary to provide some outdoor relief to persons temporarily in need, leading to the practice of distinguishing between the permanent and temporary poor. Gradually the counties became direct participants in relief administration, both financially and administratively, resulting in a diffusion of administrative responsibilities and a complexity of organization which has continued unchecked to the present day.

The development of public assistance in New Jersey was essentially a reaction to the changing needs and conditions of social pressure. The almshouse care of the 19th century arose primarily because the original forms of outdoor relief proved inadequate to meet the needs of expanding relief demands. The administration of public almshouses soon deteriorated. Shocking discoveries of abuse eventually turned the tide of public opinion against indoor relief methods. It was inevitable that the process of herding all classes of the poor together in an almshouse, in unsanitary living conditions, and in a morally degrading atmosphere, would eventually be condemned and eliminated.¹¹

In 1898, a special legislative commission, after investigating the provisions for child welfare in New Jersey, severely criticized existing practices and recommended that the State government assume some administrative responsibility for child dependency relief. Almshouse care for children, said the commission, "has absolutely no advocates or apologists, and is universally regarded as being thoroughly disgraceful. The men and women in an almshouse are society's wrecks and failures. To rear children under their influence is a sure method of making paupers."¹²

In 1899, following a second report by the same legislative commission, the legislature created the State board of children's guardians, vesting in it supervisory powers over certain classes of dependent children.¹³ Under the terms of the statute, children in

the public almshouses were to be placed under State guardianship, and later transferred by the board to private foster homes. Thereafter all children committed by local relief authorities to public almshouses became wards of the board, and were placed by this agency in foster homes. Supervision of the program was conducted solely by the administrative agents of the board, with administrative expenses paid by the State. However, the actual cost of maintaining children in foster homes was paid for by the counties and municipalities.

Child welfare and child dependency: The major steps of the subsequent growth of the State child welfare program may be summarized. In a few years, the board had succeeded in removing the children from the almshouses, and for a time their work was limited solely to children whom the local overseers would ordinarily have sent to the almshouse.¹⁴ In 1913, however, State participation was greatly expanded with the passage of mothers' pension legislation authorizing the care of dependent children in their own homes under specified conditions and subject to regulation by the board.¹⁵ This act provided cash relief to widows with dependent children under 16 years of age upon order to the county court. The board was required to present information to the court regarding the legal residence and conditions of need of the applicant. If these findings indicated aid was necessary to insure the proper care of the mother's children, the court authorized a grant at monthly rates specified by the statute. All such court orders were paid from county and municipal funds.

Further expansion of State participation in child dependency relief occurred in 1915 when the legislature authorized county courts and the juvenile courts to commit children to the custody of the State board of children's guardians upon a finding of parental neglect, abuse, or desertion.¹⁶ This legislation made it possible for the State to assume control over many child dependency cases which hitherto had been maintained on outdoor relief under the exclusive jurisdiction of the local overseers of the poor.

Expanding State relief services: In 1932, following a series of reports by the pension survey commission, the legislature extended mothers' aid to include cases where the husband was alive but had either deserted his family or was unable because of illness or imprisonment to provide for his family, and to cases where the mother was dead or missing but someone was standing in loco parentis.¹⁷

This legislation also provided for court determination in all cases of child dependency relief. All applications for categorical relief for a dependent child were presented to a county court where, after investigation and report by the State board of children's guardians, decision was made as to eligibility for relief, and if allowed, the terms and conditions of such assistance. The financing of child dependency relief, however, still remained a local responsibility. The State continued to pay only the administrative expenses incurred by the State board of children's guardians. The success of the child welfare program stimulated further development of categorical relief services set apart from the poor laws and operated under State supervision and control.

Unprecedented demands for public relief during the depression of the early 1930's

⁵ Samuel Allinson, "Acts of the General Assembly of the Province of New Jersey, 1702-1776."

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Stafford, "Government and the Needy" at 43 (1941).

⁹ Revised statutes of New Jersey, 1821.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ Stafford, op. cit. supra 71-72 (note 8).

¹² First report of the New Jersey Commission on Defective, Delinquent and Dependent Children (1898).

¹³ Second report of the New Jersey Commission on Defective, Delinquent and Dependent Children (1899).

¹⁴ Stafford, op. cit., supra 83-85 (note 8).

¹⁵ Public Laws of New Jersey, 1913, ch. 281.

¹⁶ Public Laws of New Jersey, 1915, ch. 246.

¹⁷ Public Laws of New Jersey, 1932, ch. 263-267.

fell with tremendous force upon the existing structure of public assistance in New Jersey. Prior to the depression, relief as it was known in New Jersey made no adequate provision for the adult, able-bodied poor. As a result New Jersey was unprepared and ill equipped to meet the problem of large-scale unemployment arising out of the depression. Unprecedented relief demands totally collapsed the poor law system of relief then in existence. This eventually led to the combined efforts of the State and Federal Governments to bring some order out of the chaos which followed. The most significant development during this turbulent period of readjustment of relief was the expansion of direct State responsibility for the local administration of relief and recognition by the Federal Government that relief and public welfare were a national responsibility requiring Federal regulation, control, and uniformity.

The Social Security Act of 1935: With the recognition by Congress of a national responsibility to provide for the health and welfare of the people during periods of economic distress, Congress enacted the Social Security Act on August 14, 1935, providing services covering public assistance, pensions, social insurance, health services, and child welfare services. Perhaps the most significant piece of legislation ever passed by Congress in the field of child welfare, the Social Security Act is today the most controlling legislation affecting the administration of child welfare and child dependency assistance in the States and their political subdivisions. While the act is not mandatory on any State government, in order to qualify for Federal grants-in-aid under the act, New Jersey made the necessary changes in its categorical relief laws, thereby bringing the entire program of relief in New Jersey under Federal supervision.¹⁸ At this time, the mandatory process of a court hearing for all cases involving mothers' assistance was abandoned, and the responsibility for the determination of relief grants for mothers with children was transferred to the county welfare boards.

As originally enacted the preamble to the Social Security Act is as follows: "An act to provide for the general welfare by establishing a system of Federal old age benefits, and by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for aged persons, blind persons, dependent and crippled children, maternal and child welfare, public health, and the administration of their unemployment compensation laws; to establish a social security board; to raise revenue; and for other purposes."

The most recent amendments were made by Congress and enacted into law on July 25, 1962.

Title 4 of the act provides for grants to States for aid to dependent children, and services to needy families with children. It provides appropriations for the purpose of encouraging the care of dependent children in their own homes, or in the homes of relatives by enabling the State to give financial assistance, rehabilitation, and other services to dependent children and their parents or relatives with whom they are living, and to help the parents or relatives to attain or retain capability for the maximum self-support and personal independence consistent with the maintenance of continuing parental care and protection. To achieve these aims Congress appropriates each year a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act, and such sums are made available to the States which have submitted and had approved by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare a State plan capable of rendering these services.

¹⁸ Public Laws of New Jersey, 1936, ch. 29-33.

In order for a State plan to qualify for Federal aid under this program, the plan must contain the following provisions:

1. Plan must be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State and if administered by them, must be mandatory upon them.

2. It must provide for financial participation by the State.

3. There must be a single State agency designated by the State to administer the plan.

4. It must provide an opportunity for a fair hearing before the State agency to any individual whose claim is denied or not acted upon within a reasonable time.

5. In determining need the plan must take into consideration all income and resources of any child or relative claiming aid to families with dependent children as well as any expenses reasonably attributable to the earning of such income; except that in making such determination, the State may, subject to limitations prescribed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, permit all or any portion of the earned income or other income to be set aside for future identifiable needs of a dependent child.

6. An opportunity must be given to all individuals wishing to make application for aid under the program, and suitable safeguards must be set up to restrict the use or disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients to purposes directly connected with the administration of the ADC program.

7. Upon the furnishing of aid to families with dependent children who have been deserted or abandoned by a parent, prompt notice must be given to appropriate law enforcement officials.

Other provisions are required relating to the establishment of a merit system for personnel employed to administer the program, the making of appropriate reports by the State agency and a description of services made available by the State to maintain and strengthen family life for children.

Residency requirements: Presently there is no statutory residency requirement limiting eligibility for assistance under the ADC program in New Jersey.¹⁹

The commissioner of the department of institutions and agencies is empowered by statute to promulgate all rules and regulations necessary for the proper administration of the ADC program in order to comply with and receive maximum Federal grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act.²⁰ However, in order to comply with the Federal residency requirement, no limitation may be placed upon any dependent child applying for aid who has resided in the State for at least 1 year prior to the application for aid, or who was born within 1 year immediately preceding the application if the parent or relative with whom the child is living has resided in New Jersey for at least 1 year preceding the child's birth. While it is not mandatory upon the State, the Federal Government has suggested and recommends that all residency requirement restrictions affecting applicants for ADC be eliminated.

Termination of Federal aid: ²¹ After reasonable notice and an opportunity for a hearing to the State agency Federal funds can be withheld if:

1. The provisions of the plan have been so changed that they no longer comply with the requirements of the act, or in the administration of the plan there is a substantial failure to comply with its provisions or,

2. Where the plan has been changed so as to impose a residency requirement prohibited by the act, and such prohibited residency requirement is imposed with knowledge of the State agency administering the plan.

However, where a State statute prohibits or denies aid to a dependent child, Federal aid will not be withheld if an analogous statute makes adequate provision for the necessary care and assistance with respect to such dependent child.

Payments to be used for the benefit of the child: Whenever there is reason to believe that payments of aid to families with dependent children are not being used in the best interest of the child, counseling and guidance may be provided, if advisable, to assure use of the payments in the best interest of the child. Where counseling and guidance is refused, or is unsuccessful, a guardian or legal representative may be appointed for such child and the State may impose by statute criminal or civil penalties. However, money payments not used for the benefit of the child by any relative receiving such payment must be determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

DEFINITIONS ²²

"Aid to dependent children" means money payments in behalf of medical care or any type of remedial care to a dependent child or dependent children.

A "dependent child" is a needy child under the age of 18 deprived of parental support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of the parent, who is living with a parent or some other legally recognized relative. Aid to dependent children also includes foster care in behalf of a child eligible for care in the foster home of any individual or to a public or nonprofit child placement or child care agency, or in a child care institution.

A "child care institution" is a nonprofit, private child care institution which is licensed by the State or which has been approved by the State agency responsible for licensing or approval as meeting the standards necessary for such licensing or approval.

Federal responsibility: ²³ The responsibilities of administering grants for the ADC program under the Social Security Act is discharged through the Bureau of Public Assistance in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its responsibilities are carried out by the following devices:

1. Developing program policies and standards interpreting the language and intent of the Federal law.
2. Taking action on State plans and amendments.
3. Certifying Federal grants to States.
4. Reviewing and evaluating State operations.
5. Providing technical assistance to States.
6. Collecting and interpreting statistical and other data.
7. Furnishing information about the public assistance programs.
8. Participating in the formulation of recommendations to the Congress for desirable changes in Federal legislation.

State responsibility: ²⁴ Under the Social Security Act, the State has the primary responsibility for the initiation and development of the public assistance programs. The public assistance titles of the Federal act are enabling legislation; the decision to operate a program with Federal participation

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., (pt. I, 4000-4300)—"Federal Responsibility."

²⁴ Ibid., (pt. I, 5000-5999)—"The State Responsibility," Nov. 29, 1955.

¹⁹ N.J.S.A. 30:5-5 repealed 1959.

²⁰ N.J.S.A. 44:10-3.

²¹ "Handbook of U.S. Public Assistance Administration (1962)."

in accordance with the Social Security Act rests with the State. The relationship between the Federal Government and the State government is established voluntarily by a State and on its own initiative. Once established, this relationship is a continuing one; as long as a State has an approved State plan and is operating in compliance with it, the State is eligible to receive Federal funds.

STATE ADMINISTRATION OF ADC

When Congress passed the Social Security Act in 1935, New Jersey had already provided, through State legislation, programs to provide assistance to needy and dependent children through what has been previously referred to as mothers' pensions and the home life program, as administered by the State board of children's guardians. However, to insure uniformity of administration, Congress required as a condition precedent to State eligibility for grants-in-aid under the program, that each State enact laws that are statewide, and if administered by its political subdivisions, are made mandatory upon them.

In January of 1960 the administration of the ADC program was transferred to the counties and in accord with this provision each county administers the program identically with all others.²⁵ No one county may elect to reject or discontinue ADC without risking loss of Federal aid to the entire State. This applies to the eligibility factors of needs as adopted by Congress and the Bureau of Assistance in New Jersey's Department of Welfare, which by statute is the supervisory agency on the State level.

As assurance of State compliance with the act, the attorney general must certify that all counties are administering the plan in accordance with the rules and regulations of the department of institutions and agencies, bureau of assistance, and that such rules and regulations are mandatory on all counties. This certification includes a statement setting forth all administrative and legal measures available to the department of institutions and agencies whenever it would be necessary to enforce compliance by the counties with the rules and regulations as promulgated by the department.

State department of institutions and agencies: By statute the Governor has authority to designate the State administrative agency to carry out the purposes of the Federal law including its administration or the suspension of administration.²⁶ The department of institutions and agencies or such other State agency as designated by the Governor must be the sole agency for carrying out such purposes, and the department of institutions and agencies is designated and empowered to act as the sole agency in New Jersey to carry out the administration of this plan.

Acting pursuant to such designation, the department is authorized to submit to the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service (HEW) applications for funds to carry out the purpose of any such Federal law, and to accept and receive as custodian any and all grants and money awarded for assistance in New Jersey. All moneys so received are deposited by the department in a special fund used exclusively for the purposes of the Federal law, and such funds are expended in the same manner as other funds of the State—upon vouchers certified or approved by the department as provided by Federal law.

Statutory procedure for ADC administration:²⁷ Those entitled to assistance under ADC are needy dependent children living in New Jersey and the parent or parents or relative or relatives with whom they are living. Financial assistance and other services must

be given by the county welfare boards and administered in accordance with all rules, regulations, conditions, and limitations as imposed by law.

Rules and regulations: The commissioner of the State department of institutions and agencies under the general policies of the State board of control is authorized by statute to issue all appropriate department orders and cause to be done all other acts necessary to obtain for New Jersey the maximum Federal participation available in respect to the program.

While this statutory provision provides administrative discretion in the promulgation of such rules and regulations as to accomplish the necessary and desired end of the ADC program, to comply with the Federal Social Security Act, the State statute enumerates the following provisions mandatory upon the State board and the commissioner in the promulgation of its rules and regulations:

1. The program must be in effect in all counties.
2. All individuals making applications for aid must be given an opportunity to do so and that assistance will be furnished in a reasonable and prompt manner.
3. In determining need, all resources and other income of the applicant must be taken into consideration, including resources of the dependent child and its parents or relatives with whom the child is living.
4. To provide for adequate safeguards regarding the disclosure of information concerning applicants and recipients.
5. Prompt notice must be given to law enforcement officials of the furnishing of assistance to a child who has been deserted or abandoned by a parent.
6. Where assistance is given, an assurance that no other income is received by the recipient by any other agency of the State or from any of its political subdivisions.
7. To prescribe the services which will be available by or utilized by the county welfare boards for the purpose of maintaining and strengthening family life for children.
8. That all such grants made under the program will be terminated promptly and other arrangements made for the care of such child or children in any case where it is determined that the payments made to a parent or relative are failing to secure for the child or children a standard of maintenance, care, and family life consistent with the adequate protection and care of such child or children.²⁸

Reimbursement provisions: County welfare boards are empowered to secure from parents or relatives with whom a child is living and receiving aid under the ADC program a written promise to repay all assistance granted. Where such parents, relatives, or the estate of any child refuses to make repayment in accordance with their written promise the county welfare board may take all necessary steps and proper action under the laws of the State to enforce such promise, and the granting of assistance is deemed due consideration for the promise to repay.

Where a child dies prior to his 21st birthday and has received assistance under the ADC program, and leaves an estate, the total amount of assistance paid with respect to such child is a valid and enforceable claim against such estate, with priority over all other unsecured claims except reasonable funeral expenses and terminal medical and hospital expenses. The county welfare board is empowered to take all necessary and proper action under the laws of the State to enforce such claim, however the county welfare board may, with the consent and approval of the bureau of assistance, compro-

mise and settle any claim for repayment of assistance granted.²⁹

Payments to county welfare boards: Each county welfare board receives from the State the full amount of any funds received by the State from the Federal Government with respect to expenditures made by the county welfare boards for assistance to dependent children, plus an additional amount equal to 50 percent of the balance of such expenditures after deducting the amount of the Federal participation. In addition, the State pays to the county welfare boards any funds received from the Federal Government with respect to the cost of administration of the program by such county welfare boards.³⁰

County welfare boards: The board of chosen freeholders in each county is responsible for establishing the county welfare board which, when created is a separate corporate entity with power to sue and be sued and to make bylaws. Five members are appointed to the board, at least two of whom must be women. A county adjutor, if not acting as director of welfare, and two members of the board of chosen freeholders, act as ex officio members of the board. The five citizen members hold their offices for 5 years, and vacancies are filled for the unexpired term only. Such boards must meet regularly once a month and at such other times as may be necessary. Members serve without compensation, but are reimbursed for necessary expenses.

County welfare boards receive and act upon all applications for assistance, and are charged with carrying out the administration of assistance programs in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by the State bureau of assistance.

Each board appoints a director of welfare or a county adjutor who when qualified may be appointed to the office of the director of welfare. Directors of welfare, when appointed serve a probationary period of 6 to 12 months, and thereafter usually serve for a term of 5 years. The welfare director is the chief executive officer and approval officer of the county welfare board. In addition, he acts as clerk to the county welfare board with out additional compensation. To become eligible for appointment to such position, he must have an adequate knowledge of the law pertaining to assistance, be a trained and qualified expert in the field of welfare with administrative experience, a citizen of New Jersey, and of the United States.³¹

Applications for assistance: When the county welfare board receives an application for assistance an investigation and record is made to ascertain the facts supporting the application, and assistance must be furnished within a reasonable time, usually construed to be not more than 30 days, to all eligible individuals. All applications for assistance together with the subsequent investigations, reports and decisions pertaining to such application must be reported to the State bureau of assistance. Where an application has been denied, not acted upon, or where the grant made is deemed inadequate by either the State agency or the applicant, such decision may be reviewed either by the State agency at its discretion or by the individual applicant through appeal to the State agency, at which time such applicant is provided with a fair hearing and a complete review of his circumstances.

Legally responsible relatives: According to law the director of welfare of the county welfare board is empowered to compel reimbursement by legally responsible relatives of a recipient receiving assistance, and in the event that such relatives fail or refuse to enter into an agreement for the support of the

²⁵ N.J.S.A. 44:10-1 et seq.

²⁶ N.J.S.A. 30:1-20 et seq.

²⁷ N.J.S.A. 44:10-1 et seq.

²⁸ N.J.S.A. 44:10-2.

²⁹ N.J.S.A. 44:10-4

³⁰ N.J.S.A. 44:10-5

³¹ N.J.S.A. 44:7-7

applicant, he may compel their appearance before the county court or the court of juvenile and domestic relations. The court, upon hearing may order and adjudge the legally responsible relatives to pay such sums as determined by the court and to deliver to the director of welfare such other pledges or guarantees as the court may require in its discretion. Upon failure of a legally responsible relative to comply with such order the legally responsible relative may be held in contempt. Any applicant or other person who knowingly gives false information to the director of welfare as relating to the application for assistance for the purpose of securing assistance payments shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. By statute, grandparents, their children, and grandchildren are all legally responsible relatives.³²

CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILIES RECEIVING ADC

To satisfy the requirements of the Federal Bureau of Public Assistance a study is made biennially of the characteristics of families receiving aid under the aid to dependent children program. The latest study was made in December of 1961 and is referred to as the "Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Dependent Children." This study shows the number of families and children and their peculiar characteristics for the month in which the study is made. All statistics contained in the biennial survey are tabulated on a monthly basis and are applicable for the month of December 1961.³³

Families on ADC: In December 1961 there were 19,844 families in New Jersey receiving aid to dependent children. These families included 52,532 children, all under 18 years of age. In 17,185 of the families there was a responsible adult—usually the mother—who was also included in the grant.³⁴

The Census Bureau estimates that there are about 2,010,150 children in New Jersey under 18 years of age. In New Jersey, children on ADC represent about 2.61 percent of all these children. Over the Nation as a whole, 3.3 percent of all children receive aid.³⁵

Total grants to ADC families in December 1961 amounted to \$3,277,591. This amounted to an average of \$165.16 per family, or \$62.38 per child each month (includes adult grant, average per child grant, approximately \$47 per month).³⁶

Of the total grants to recipients in December 1961, the Federal Government paid 44 percent, the State paid 28 percent, and the counties collectively paid 28 percent.³⁷

Racial characteristics: In December of 1961, 6,924 (approximately 35 percent) of the ADC families were white; 12,870 (approximately 65 percent), were nonwhite; while according to the population census, 91.3 percent of the population of the State was white; and 8.7 percent was nonwhite.³⁸

Place of residence: The ADC families of December 1961 were distributed as follows according to area and type of place lived in:

Number of families and children—Place of residence by race³⁹

	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	Family	Children	Family	Children	Family	Children
Total.....	19,844	52,532	6,924	17,536	12,920	34,996
Urban:						
City of 250,000 to 499,999.....	7,953	20,847	1,681	4,641	6,272	16,106
City less than 250,000.....	7,752	19,944	2,584	5,971	5,168	13,973
Urban fringe.....	778	2,183	602	1,656	176	527
Other urban.....	677	1,982	426	1,129	251	853
Rural:						
Nonfarm.....	226	878	151	401	75	477
Farm.....	25	50	25	50		
Not in standard metropolitan statistical area:						
Urban.....	2,207	5,845	1,304	3,271	903	2,634
Rural: Nonfarm.....	226	803	151	477	75	326

³⁹ Ibid.

There appears to be no significant difference in size of families receiving assistance in rural and urban areas.

The father of the children: To be eligible for ADC a child must be in financial need and deprived of the care and support of a parent because of the parent's death, disability, or continued absence from the home. In actual fact it is the lack of support from the father which, in the great majority of cases, gives rise to the need for financial help for the children. Therefore, the status of the fathers with respect to the children's eligibility for ADC gives some indication of the immediate cause of the child dependency in New Jersey.

Deserting fathers make up more than one-third or 35.6 percent of all cases; the next largest group was 33.2 percent of the total families with children in need because they never had a legal father; 8.5 percent were

separated without legal decree; 6.4 percent were fathers who were incapacitated; 6.1 percent were fathers who were imprisoned; 4.7 percent families were divorced or legally separated; others for miscellaneous reasons amounted to 0.5 percent.

Status of father—December 1961⁴⁰

	Families	Children	Amount
Total.....	19,844	52,532	\$3,277,591
Dead.....	1,204	3,487	178,243
Incapacitated.....	1,280	4,164	269,108
Divorced or separated.....	928	2,308	117,859
Separated without court decree.....	1,681	4,867	236,972
Desertions.....	7,075	21,249	1,327,905
Not married to mother.....	6,573	13,773	960,982
Imprisoned.....	1,003	2,408	166,703
Absent for other reasons.....	75	226	14,149
Other status.....	25	50	5,670

⁴⁰ Ibid.

Number of families and children by race and status of father⁴¹

	Total		White		Nonwhite	
	Families	Children	Families	Children	Families	Children
Total.....	19,844	52,532	6,924	17,536	12,920	34,996
Dead.....	1,204	3,484	602	1,405	602	2,082
Incapacitated.....	1,280	4,164	703	2,106	577	2,058
Divorced or legally separated.....	928	2,308	702	1,706	226	602
Separated without court decree.....	1,681	4,867	552	1,405	1,129	3,462
Desertions.....	7,075	21,249	2,835	7,802	4,240	13,447
Not married to mother.....	6,573	13,773	1,054	1,957	5,519	11,816
Imprisoned.....	1,003	2,408	426	1,054	577	1,354
Other.....	100	276	50	101	50	175

⁴¹ Ibid.

Status of father by race, 1948-61⁴²

[Number of cases per month shown]

Status of father	March 1948		November 1953		March 1956		November 1958		December 1961	
	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white	White	Non-white
Total families.....	340	179	2,601	2,264	2,540	3,590	4,039	5,568	6,924	12,920
Dead.....	144	55	628	369	415	360	628	425	602	602
Incapacitated.....	79	22	571	171	550	270	739	435	703	577
Divorced or legally separated.....	15	1	88	21	70	30	192	61	702	226
Separated without court decree.....	(120)	(120)	42	31	60	70		31	552	1,129
Desertions.....	54	56	763	722	1,060	1,030	1,488	1,964	2,835	4,240
Not married to mother.....	15	29	234	685	270	1,420	617	2,187	1,054	5,519
Imprisoned.....	(120)	(120)	182	218	220	280	365	445	426	577
Other.....	33	16	93	47	160	130	10	20	50	50

⁴² Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving ADC, March 1948 through December 1961, Department of Institutions and Agencies.

⁴³ Included with desertions.

⁴⁴ Unknown.

³² N.J.S.A. 44:7-19.

³³ Biennial Statistical Report on Characteristics of Families Receiving Aid to Dependent Children (December 1961), hereafter referred to as 1961 biennial report.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ 1960 Census of Population, Advance Reports, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce.

³⁶ 1961 biennial report.

³⁷ Summary of Selected Statistics Covering the Aid to Dependent Children Assistance Program (Dec. 12, 1962), New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, Bureau of Assistance.

³⁸ 1961 biennial report.

Of the total number of families receiving assistance (19,844) under ADC 6,924 are white families responsible for 17,536 white children; nonwhite families receiving ADC assistance totaled 12,920 and are responsible for 34,996 children dependent upon this assistance. By far the largest groups creating need for assistance to needy children result from desertions and the birth of illegitimate children which amount to approximately 68.8 percent of all cases receiving aid under this program. Since these groups constitute the greatest problem to efficient relief administration they are treated separately in the following chapter of this report.

The growth of ADC: In order to comprehend the magnitude and complexity of ADC in New Jersey, it is necessary that some mention be made of the relative growth of this program during the past years. It cannot be denied that while the greatest increase for assistance results from desertions and illegitimacy, the most startling explosion has taken place among the growth in the non-white illegitimate child. There is every reason to believe that this trend will continue unless present methods dealing with this problem are greatly revamped.

Equally impressive in reviewing the overall pattern of family units receiving ADC assistance is the voluminous mushrooming not only of families on ADC but the number of children involved which has grown proportionally with caseloads. While the total number of families receiving assistance in

November of 1953 amounted to 4,865, by December of 1961 this figure increased to 19,844.⁴²

In November 1953 the number of children receiving aid was 12,393, but in December of 1961 this figure increased to 52,532. In a short period of 8 years, New Jersey was required to meet the increasing demands of an additional 14,979 families, with a corresponding increase of 40,139 additional children.⁴³ These increases in both cases and number of children are reflected in the costs of annual net assistance which in 1953 was \$6,495,780 and in 1961 reached a total of \$39,357,141, an increase of \$32,861,361.⁴⁴ The following schedule is indicative of this growth for the period March 1948 to December 1961.

For review purposes the committee referred to annual expenditures for this program made by the Federal Government, and the matching contributions by the State and county governments, for a period of 20 years. The chart on the following page indicates such expenditures in both dollars and percent of contribution. It will be noted that expenditures for the fiscal period 1960-61 were \$31,925,466, while expenditures for the fiscal year 1961-62 increased to \$39,357,141, representing last year's annual increase of almost \$8 million. Costs mushroomed since the fiscal period 1956-57, increasing by \$2 million; 1957-58 by \$3 million; 1958-59 \$4 million; 1959-60 \$6 million; 1960-61 \$8 million and 1961-62 \$8 million.

Division by families and children on ADC, by race, 1948-61⁴⁵—Total annual ADC expenditures

Number and division of families	March 1948	November 1953	March 1956	November 1958	December 1961
Total number of families	519	4,865	6,430	9,607	19,844
Total number of children	1,292	12,393	16,610	23,384	52,532
White families	340	2,601	2,840	4,039	6,924
White children	858	6,360	7,170	9,566	17,536
Nonwhite families	179	2,264	3,590	5,568	12,920
Nonwhite children	434	6,033	9,140	13,818	34,996
Annual net assistance	\$4,414,404	\$6,495,780	\$8,955,718	\$17,617,360	\$39,357,141

⁴² Biennial Statistical Reports, 1948-61, op. cit., supra note 42.

Summary of selected statistics covering the aid to dependent children assistance program for the fiscal years 1942-43 through 1961-62 (December 12, 1962)

[State of New Jersey, Department of Institutions and Agencies, Division of Welfare—Bureau of Assistance]

Fiscal year	Net assistance	Federal share		State share		County share	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1942-43	\$2,582,347	\$1,182,525	45.8	\$503,008	19.5	\$896,814	34.7
1943-44	2,066,573	732,241	35.4	667,225	32.3	667,107	32.3
1944-45	2,274,813	677,953	29.8	798,693	35.1	798,167	35.1
1945-46	2,574,011	678,611	26.4	948,210	36.8	947,190	36.8
1946-47	3,337,882	1,077,984	32.3	1,064,543	31.9	1,195,355	35.8
1947-48	4,414,404	1,405,354	31.8	1,402,835	31.8	1,606,215	36.4
1948-49	4,922,094	1,876,260	37.6	1,338,496	27.2	1,767,338	35.2
1949-50	5,632,684	2,128,307	37.7	1,514,019	26.9	1,992,358	35.4
1950-51	6,040,271	2,649,333	43.9	1,398,380	23.1	1,992,558	33.0
1951-52	6,178,940	2,756,338	44.6	1,407,031	22.8	2,015,571	32.6
1952-53	6,495,780	3,119,157	48.0	1,281,005	19.7	2,095,618	32.3
1953-54	6,580,846	3,265,717	49.6	1,210,158	18.4	2,104,971	32.0
1954-55	7,768,113	3,678,187	47.4	1,548,001	19.9	2,541,925	32.7
1955-56	8,955,718	4,126,164	46.1	1,859,870	20.8	2,969,684	33.1
1956-57	10,809,591	4,992,892	46.2	2,190,421	20.3	3,626,278	33.5
1957-58	13,640,749	6,222,418	45.6	2,828,305	20.7	4,590,026	33.7
1958-59	17,617,360	7,906,279	44.9	3,791,763	21.5	5,919,318	33.6
July 1, 1959-Dec. 31, 1959	11,018,441	4,799,964	43.5	2,478,200	22.5	3,740,277	34.0
Jan. 1, 1960-June 30, 1960	12,778,832	5,750,517	45.0	3,514,163	27.5	3,514,152	27.5
1960-61	31,925,466	14,106,972	44.2	8,909,247	27.9	8,909,247	27.9
1961-62	39,357,141	17,304,117	44.0	11,026,512	28.0	11,026,512	28.0

Total costs for all welfare programs in New Jersey are expected to reach a new high in 1962-63 of approximately \$88 million with about half of this expenditure budgeted for the ADC program. This means an approximate increase from 1961-62 expenditures of another \$8 million bringing the total expenditures for ADC for 1962-63 to approximately \$45 million.

At the present time, no end to these increases is in sight. The upward spiral of welfare costs will continue to rise unless an effective program is adopted by the State to

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Summary of Selected Statistics, op. cit., supra note 37.

combat the social and economic evils which give rise to dependency and relief. In 1960-61 total welfare expenditures were \$72 million; in 1961-62, \$79 million; in 1962-63 \$88 million and increases in the aid to dependent children program account for practically all such increases.

A direct relationship to the average amount of grants made under the program to the families receiving aid reveals another dynamic factor responsible for overall increases of Federal, State, and county expenditures.

Average ADC monthly grant⁴⁶

	Average per family or case aided	Average per person aided
1952	\$100.74	\$30.16
1953	109.17	32.45
1954	110.23	32.69
1955	116.06	34.76
1956	119.87	35.87
1957	130.66	39.34
1958	141.04	42.22
1959	149.03	45.01
1960	157.08	45.93
1961	160.02	45.18

⁴⁶ Division of Welfare, State Department of Institutions and Agencies (July 26, 1961).

A comparison of grants paid during the month of November of 1958 and December of 1961 according to size of family and grant reveals areas of greatest increase.

Average approximate amount of grant for months shown⁴⁷

	November 1958	December 1961
Number in family:		
1	\$47	\$56
2	114	133
3	158	182
4	192	217
5	233	259
6	260	292
7	303	355
8	311	371
9	370	388
10	358	505

⁴⁷ Biennial Statistical Reports (1958 and 1961).

It must be emphasized that the above schedule reflects only average size grants for all families having 1 to 10 or more children. Actual cases, as corroborated by the committee's investigations show that in many cases grants to individual families far exceed the above indicated average monthly grant of \$505. Such cases, of course, present varied problems which go to the very heart of relief assistance in New Jersey. The question arises whether such large grants are inimical to family self-help and rehabilitation and whether the size of the grant itself militates against the presence of personal motivation, vital to any program whose legitimate aims and objectives are primarily designed to aid family unity and reconciliation to relieve the dependent person from an atmosphere of dependency to independence.

DESERTIONS

Desertion, when spoken in reference to the ADC program necessarily implies the abandonment of children by a parent, usually the father. Of the 52,532 children on ADC in December 1961, 21,249 had been abandoned by a parent. These children came from 7,075 families residing in New Jersey, and they account for more than one-third of all children receiving aid.

By law, desertion is a criminal act punishable by both fines and imprisonment.⁴⁸ Yet, in spite of criminal penalties prescribed by statute, desertion ranks highest as the pri-

⁴⁸ N.J.S.A. 9:6-3.

mary cause of child dependency in New Jersey.

Abandonment of a child consists in any of the following acts by one having lawful custody or control of a child: (a) willfully forsaking a child, (b) failure to protect such child, thereby exposing the child to physical or moral risks, and (c) failure to maintain a child so that such child becomes liable for maintenance and support at public expense, or by child-caring societies or private persons not legally responsible for the child's care.⁵⁰

Any parent, guardian, or person having the care, custody, or control of any child who abuses, abandons, or neglects such child is deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction may be fined not more than \$500, or be imprisoned with or without hard labor as the court may direct for a term not exceeding 3 years or both.⁵¹

Where fines are imposed, the court may direct that the fines be paid in whole or in part to the wife, guardian, custodian, or trustee of the minor child. The court may also in the best interest of the child place it in temporary care or custody of a child-caring society. Under such circumstances where a child is placed in the care of an agency or society, the court may postpone sentence on the father or person standing in loco parentis and require such person to pay the stipulated sum for the maintenance of such child. Failure to make payments as directed by the court can result in the arrest and arraignment and imposition of the fine and penalties as prescribed by statute.⁵²

Desertion is usually an impulsive and unplanned action in which the father disappears, in most cases leaving the mother alone to plan for herself and the children on a day-to-day basis. Quite often these mothers continue to bear children for their husbands while receiving ADC benefits, and their eligibility for the continuance of such payments based on the alleged desertion and abandonment by the father is rarely ever questioned. Payments are merely increased with the addition of each new child in the family.

Many such mothers while on ADC consort with paramours—the illicit relationship often resulting in the birth of an illegitimate child who becomes part of the family on public assistance.

The effects of desertion upon a mother and her children are devastating and often of long duration. Yet each year the number of children deserted by a parent who requires public assistance climbs in a dizzying spiral. In May of 1948 there were 112 such families on ADC; in December of 1961, this figure jumped to 7,075.⁵³

The committee believes from evidence uncovered by its investigations that the incidence of ADC encouraging fathers to desert is probably very small. But this suppository problem loses most of its probative value, and is inconsequential, when we consider the direct effect ADC has on family reconciliation especially when the deserting father returns from his wanderings. Evidence indicates that quite often he does return. Here the committee has found all too frequently that if ADC does not encourage the abandonment of children by their fathers, once the desertion has occurred, it does not encourage reunion. The plain fact is that money payments made through ADC often far exceed the earning power of the allegedly deserting father. Without exception, witnesses testified that if the husband desired to return and resume his role as breadwinner for the family, his return would be discouraged, if not resisted by outright rejection.

Competent witnesses in public welfare and others closely allied to it have testified to the deleterious effects of excessive ADC payments upon family reconciliations; of continued family dependency upon ADC; of its fatal effect upon illegitimacy by deterring marriages which might have otherwise taken place between putative fathers of illegitimate children and their unmarried mothers had there been no ADC benefits forthcoming or assured.

The following testimony of John Kabala, Deputy Director of Welfare of Atlantic County, points out this deficiency and describes its impact on both those on relief and the caseworker employed to service these families.

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "Well, again I would like to ask you if there are any suggestions you have in addition to those you have already made."

Answer. "Well, * * * another thing that bothers me and bothers the caseworkers—you have a husband, wife, and three children living together. That man would go out to work every day and bring home \$45 a week. They were living off that money for 1, 2, 3 years. They become incompatible, let's say, or he deserts, or he separates for some reason, and the grant is jumped over and above what that man could normally make at his job. The mother, the recipient, knows that she gets more money by having this man out of the house and therefore, she does not want him back in the house and there is no chance of a reconciliation. If the grant were cut down or compatible with the going rate in the community of a man or average family, making that money so much that they can live off of it—because we provide them with all medical care * * * and, to the average family man today, that is worth at least \$25 a month * * *."

Question. "You find that the amount of money given under the ADC program is far greater in many instances than the amount of money a man?"

Answer. "Yes, than what the man can bring into the family. In fact * * * I find that if I separated from my wife and go down to the probation office and sign a consent order of so much money she'd be taking home \$75 a month more than I'm working and making for the family now * * * it's a serious problem with our caseworkers who have to sit down and write out a budget for a (ADC) family comparable to their (own) family, and that (ADC) family is taking home more money than they are making actually in salaries."

Question. "You may be interested in knowing that Atlantic County is not alone in that situation. We have found that to be more or less a pattern throughout the State, and not in one instance have we gotten a 'yes' answer when we asked the relief recipient whether they would like to have their husband back—not one case. And most of those cases have fallen in the category we have just discussed."⁵⁴

One case investigated by the committee involved a husband and wife who applied for ADC, but were turned down because they were both living together as man and wife in the same household. Under the provisions of the Social Security Act, ADC benefits are paid only for the care of children who are deprived of parental support, and benefits are not paid where children live with both parents and neither are incapacitated. Shortly thereafter this couple went to the probation officer and signed a voluntary separation affidavit charging mutual incompatibility, although there appeared to be no marital differences between them at the time of their first application for ADC. This made the family eligible for benefits under the program, and they now receive \$249 per

month from the welfare board and \$134 a month from the father under a voluntary support agreement, which includes rights of visitation.

While this case may be easily distinguished from other cases of desertion, it is almost impossible to ascertain whether or not any collusion exists, or whether any fraud has been perpetrated by allegedly deserting fathers for the sole purpose of becoming eligible for ADC benefits.

Two typical family cases investigated by the committee involved families receiving ADC benefits due to the alleged desertion of the fathers:

The father of the family was ordered by the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court to pay weekly support for his family in the amount of \$40. Since that time he has made one payment in the amount of \$24, and at the time of this investigation was \$2,101 in arrears.

His wife and five children receive \$231 per month. When questioned about the whereabouts of her husband, she said that she has not seen her husband for approximately 1 year, and that he did not contribute to the support of the family.

An automobile registration check revealed the husband to be the owner of a late-model car which was later found parked in front of this client's house. The information was turned over to the proper authorities for further investigation.

In another case: When interviewed by this committee, the mother stated she had no idea of her husband's whereabouts. The committee found he was attending college in Washington, D.C. When investigated again during the summer, the father was found living next door to his family and was employed by a local concern. Faced with this evidence, the client admitted she knew the whereabouts of her husband, and voluntarily signed a statement to this effect. Though legal action was recommended, it was never taken, and as of December 13, 1962, neither this person nor her husband have been prosecuted.

To add to the committee's disillusionment in this case it was learned that upon graduation from college, this husband secured a divorce.

Perhaps part of the difficulty here lies in the fact that New Jersey, unlike many States, has no statutory limit to the amount of grants made under ADC. In practice the amount paid is determined by a budget based on individual needs as promulgated by the State Department of Institutions and Agencies. Since there is no limit to the size of the grant, grants naturally are higher when there are more children. As each child reaches an older age bracket, these grants are increased. Thus, a large number of families surveyed by the committee with 8, 9, and 10 children receive grants in excess of \$400 and \$500 monthly. It does not require a lively imagination to believe that such grants are far in excess of attainable family income through regular employment.

However, grants under the ADC program may be reduced by the county welfare board whenever the circumstances of the recipient change. The county welfare board may also discontinue a grant entirely whenever the father of a child returns to the home and resumes its support.

In its endeavor to get to the root of the problem that exists in New Jersey on welfare, and always looking for expert assistance, the committee turned to the Supreme Court of the State of New Jersey, and asked the chief justice to assign members of the judiciary who have had experience in handling welfare cases to testify before the committee. On the matter of deserting fathers, and the practicability of reconciliations, the following testimony by Judge Harry W.

⁵⁰ N.J.S.A. 9:6-1.

⁵¹ N.J.S.A. 9:6-3.

⁵² N.J.S.A. 9:6-3.

⁵³ Schedule on Status of Father by Race, biennial reports (1948-61).

⁵⁴ 5th Public Hearing, vol. 1 (June 21, 1962), Atlantic City, N.J.

Lindeman of the Essex County juvenile and domestic relations court, is pertinent:

"Then again I have taken the position under ADC that it is not exactly proper for ADC simply to work out how much a defaulting father needs to live on and then and only then if there is any excess, that goes toward support of the out-of-wedlock children or the normal children. Many a father has supported families that live together on far less than ADC would grant. I do not think then that we should make the separate families in a better economic position than they have had before when they were living together in perfect harmony. Otherwise we are getting certainly into the welfare state. So in those instances where, say a father is making \$75 and the children are on relief under the ADC setup and the family needs \$45, I make an order for \$45. And the man says, 'But I can't live on \$25 or \$30 a week.' I say, 'Well, do you work Saturdays?' and invariably they say 'No.' 'How about Sundays?' Invariably, 'No.' I say, 'What do you do on Saturdays?' Then comes the blank expression, 'Why nothing, Judge.' This is routine, but I am sincere about it, that thousands upon thousands of honest people who don't want their families on relief, who want some of the better things in life, a car, a television, or a summer's trip, they work on Saturdays, some of them I know, on Sundays. Some of them have second jobs. And if there is no law that prevents honest citizens from keeping their children off relief by working at second jobs, I have no fear in telling these men that if they can't live on the balance of \$25 or \$30 they must find a second job. The hard core, those who are repeaters and who drink and who come back again, and eventually, if the Probation Department thinks they are not making the effort and the welfare is supporting them—then I get a figure and I commit them to an institution until they partially pay the money. It is most interesting that we do not keep many in jail for long * * * Thousands upon thousands of dollars in Essex County, which is a big county, have come in by virtue of using the power which the court exercises for the benefit of the taxpayers."

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "You make reference to the words 'welfare state' and I know those words are very much abused and used sometimes to indicate anything that has to do with welfare. I thought that I would make reference to the remark that you made because it seems to me that that would be a good definition of what would constitute the welfare state. You pointed out that in a case where a family is living together with the husband, after the husband leaves, that family is now better off on welfare than they were when they were together. That seemed to me to be a perfect definition of what we would have to fear with respect to a welfare state."

Answer. "Not only that, but I very recently, when hearing a case, turned to the welfare representative, and I outlined something like this to him, and I said, 'Is this what you mean, that as soon as a man leaves his family for good reason or for no good reason and you compute that the family gets a certain amount of money, and never in their entire life while they lived together did they get that much money—do you mean to say that this is the position you are taking?' He said, 'The law makes us do this.' That was his answer to me. He said, 'Yes.' So in the United States of America if this were a general law, every person with five, six, seven, or eight children—all they would have to do to get additional moneys would be to leave the family and the family would be much better off. As a matter of fact, when a welfare worker found a man back with his wife and family, he said to them, 'We will now have to stop your relief. But if the man will leave and board somewhere else and pay

you \$10 a week, we will supply the difference.' So the man left. I said, 'Oh, that cannot be.' But the man and his wife were there, I examined them in open court and each confirmed that the welfare worker had said 'If you leave and pay \$10—' So he paid \$10. I asked them if there was any difference between them. They said, 'No.' I said, 'Today you return to your home and under the law you are entitled if you are not working to go to the local relief and get some help until you find a job.' Well, they didn't know that * * * but under the county schedule they can get more money than they can at the municipal level. I checked back through the social worker and I was informed that that is what the social worker did. But it was a little bit misinterpreted. The worker did say, 'While you are living together, we can't do it.' But he did not admit he said to get out and then we can pay you your money."

The committee believes that a paucity of effort has been expended under the ADC program in locating missing fathers who have abandoned their family responsibilities. More than sufficient evidence has been adduced to indicate that in the absence of such effort, the ADC program has, if anything, discouraged reconciliations, and at best, allowed to drift in a negligent and sometimes wanton manner a family disruption which compels long-term chronic dependency. We believe that a diligent pursuit of such delinquent and absconding fathers, followed if necessary by prosecution and jail confinement would go a long way in curtailing this major cause of child dependency in New Jersey.

Locating fathers who allegedly deserted their families eventually to end up on ADC rolls proved, in a majority of cases to be comparatively easy. Evidently, little effort need be expended to attain this worthwhile goal. In many cases missing fathers were located by the simple process of checking motor vehicle registrations. The same information is attainable and accessible through the Bureau of Social Security, and quite often the Division of Employment Security. Yet no exchange of information exists between these agencies and ADC officials. Consider the case of this father, who although under court order to support his children, disappeared and discontinued payments. A bench warrant was issued for his arrest, but he still remains at large, unapprehended, shirking both court order and family responsibilities.

On November 25, 1959, this father was ordered to pay \$20 per week for the support of his family by order by the Passaic County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court. His last payment of \$20 was made on September 25, 1961. At present he is \$2,810 in arrears, and is classified as an absconder. His wife and two children currently receive \$203 per month from ADC.

Investigation revealed he was employed by a delivery service in Bloomfield, N.J., and has worked there for over a year. His present salary is between \$85 and \$95 a week. Circumstances indicate this father still retains some devotion toward his wife and children, as he continues to claim them as dependents for income tax purposes even though they are being supported at public expense.

Greater resources than those presently existing must be made available on both the State and county levels to assist probation departments, caseworkers and the courts in locating fathers of abandoned children. The testimony of Joseph Greene, director of welfare in Passaic County, provides sound reasons why delay in this area might have disastrous results.

"An indictment is brought in for desertion; it is referred to the prosecutor's office or in some counties to the sheriff's office for

serving a subpoena and bringing in the deserter if possible. Have you ever checked, and I think it would be well for the committee to do that, on your prosecutors' offices in the State of New Jersey to find out how many indictments, how many times they have assigned men and detectives to try to find these deserters.

"I also might make another recommendation, and it will go far in savings of thousands of dollars: Right now, in cases of desertion and neglected children, complaints are made, they are heard in court, and the judge will say, 'All right, you are put on probation and have to pay \$30 a week.' * * * Unfortunately, the general public does not recognize the value of good organization so far as probation is concerned. * * * One does not sit down and analyze that if we were to appoint, or the courts rather, would appoint one or two probation officers, whose sole responsibility would be to follow through all persons put on probation and ordered to pay—I think it would be of interest to you folks if you would go into a probation office and ask them how much is outstanding—hundreds of thousands of dollars. It is not only the dollars and cents that are involved. The persons who have been brought into court and ordered to pay are in contempt of court, and what is the net result? He misses one, two, or three payments and nothing is done. You are not only losing that money, you are losing the respect that the court should command."

The causes of desertions are both varied and complex. The committee recognizes that many social ills contribute to this major source of family breakdown. On its face, it is evident that preventive casework can offer no solution for these families that come to the attention of public agencies and county welfare departments sometimes long after the desertion has occurred. But we believe much can be accomplished by way of locating these errant fathers, providing in the process a means by which future family reconciliations can be made possible.

We do not feel that unrealistic monthly benefits exceeding past maximum income earned through employment promotes conditions favorable to the attainment of this goal. Undoubtedly, benefits must be construed on a more practical basis to meet the basic needs of the family unit, but not to a point where ADC becomes a way of life wholly unknown to the family prior to the father's desertion.

Fathers who elect to leave their children to public support while maintaining a residence separate and apart from their family should be required to turn over all but a small portion of earned income to their family for their support. There is no logic to a system which allows fathers to leave their families while they earn a net income of \$100 a week or more and pay only \$20 a week toward their children's support while the public pays the difference. No one will deny that such bizarre circumstances rewards the wayward father with a penchant for desertion or separation, and tends to encourage, rather than discourage, a free and easy life devoid of all familial responsibility.

COLLECTIONS AND PROBATION DEPARTMENTS

It is not surprising that considerable confusion and conflict exists affecting the apprehension of fathers who desert or abandon their children. Much of the public laws controlling child abandonment were enacted in the early 1900's and date back as far as the 1930's without alteration or amendment.

Most are obsolete when applied to today's problems of child dependency. When the present laws governing child abandonment were enacted, public assistance as administered under ADC had not yet come into existence. Prior to 1935, and the enactment

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ 2d public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

of the Social Security Act by Congress creating the ADC program, cases of desertions and child abandonment coming before the courts were relatively few, resulting in early and quick disposition of complaints.

Today, under ADC alone, as previously pointed out, 21,249 children receive public assistance because of desertion and abandonment. Yet our courts, probation departments, and welfare administrators still rely on an antiquated system, largely created prior to the depression of the 1930's to counteract and control a burgeoning cause of child dependency vitally affecting the public welfare. Millions of dollars are spent each year, not for the prevention or arrest of family breakdowns caused by deserting fathers, but for the support of mothers and children victimized by the alleged desertions of footloose and irresponsible fathers.

As late as June of 1962, there existed considerable confusion as to who had the responsibility of making complaints against deserting fathers when their families applied for ADC assistance. This resulted in many families being eligible for ADC support without any complaints ever filed against the offending fathers. Consequently many fathers had been permitted by mere acts of omission by responsible officials, to leave their families without any means of support free from legal deterrents of apprehension through warrants for their arrest. Even now there exists no compulsory public law whereby complaints must be made against deserting fathers or putative fathers as a condition precedent to receipt of ADC benefits. Filing of such complaints usually rests within the discretion of county welfare directors who rely principally on written reports submitted by field social workers who investigate applications and family conditions of the applicant.

When complaints are made to the juvenile and domestic relations court, an investigation may be made through its probation department into the financial condition of the parents or legally responsible relatives of the child, the conditions surrounding the home of the parents or relatives as well as any other facts which will assist the court in determining the case, and a full report in writing must be filed with the court.⁶⁷

In practice, however, the courts usually rely on investigations and written reports of caseworkers charged with supervision of such families under authority of local county welfare boards. Where it is evident that children are abused or neglected they may be removed from the home and placed in care, custody or guardianship as the court may direct.⁶⁸ Usually care, custody and guardianship is vested in the State board of child welfare which, by law, is charged with providing foster home placement or other permanent or temporary shelter according to the needs of the child.

However, where prior conviction of a parent, guardian or person having custody and control of a minor child has occurred on grounds of abandonment, neglect, abuse or cruelty, most municipal officials, a probation officer, or guardian ad litem, may file a record of the case when such conviction was before the court with the juvenile and domestic relations court and apply to the court for relief.⁶⁹

Although demands upon the courts and probation departments have pyramided, most probation departments still retain a skeleton staff unengaged and incapable of handling the increased burdens of locating and bringing before the court for reexamination defaulting fathers of abandoned children. Bench warrants for the arrests of deserting fathers are not pursued. Absconding parents, under court order, to pay just

nominal amounts for the support of their children, often fail to pay. Investigations to locate contumacious parents seldom occur with the result that working and easily located family deserters go unapprehended, undermining both respect for the courts, our judicial process, the public laws, not to mention their own moral and social obligation of providing for their children.

Clearly the need for a more comprehensive, effective system is needed to confine abuses of deserting parents, usually the father, and to force compliance with court orders for the support of their families, especially when such desertions mean dependence by the family on public assistance and public relief.

Some idea of the costs involved in our failure to enforce mandatory court orders for the support of dependent children on ADC are reflected in the following schedule of arrearages reported by county probation offices:

Total arrears of delinquent accounts of relief recipient cases involving persons under mandatory court order

County	Number of cases	Amount of arrears
Atlantic.....	54	\$110,665
Bergen.....	65	94,677
Burlington.....	45	41,438
Camden.....	129	99,543
Cape May.....	30	79,727
Cumberland.....	33	64,444
Essex.....	324	961,907
Gloucester.....	67	84,300
Hudson.....	43	85,663
Hunterdon.....	21	42,026
Mercer.....	62	87,078
Middlesex.....	90	194,026
Monmouth.....	46	64,675
Morris.....	71	149,954
Ocean.....	20	34,046
Passaic.....	258	574,405
Salem.....	15	60,317
Somerset.....	43	70,741
Sussex.....	31	41,342
Union.....	160	121,738
Warren.....	54	92,826
Total.....	1,861	3,155,538

The balance of \$3,155,538.00 represents amounts due from currently active cases on ADC resulting from the breach of mandatory orders of support. No arrearages are included resulting from consent orders or voluntary support agreements. For instance in Camden County, an additional \$141,776 is outstanding on consent orders in addition to the above amount of \$99,543 owing from mandatory court orders. This represents income due from another 161 cases on ADC in Camden County.

In Monmouth County voluntary support agreements for families receiving ADC have resulted in an additional delinquency of \$144,327.

Since no updated figures are kept by county welfare departments on delinquent accounts due for support from deserting fathers or legally responsible relatives of children on ADC, no audit was made by the committee to ascertain the exact amounts due, but a fairly safe estimate of an approximate \$10 million delinquency or more probably exists from all outstanding agreements; court orders and consent agreements.

Juvenile and domestic relations courts and our probation officers are overtaxed with the result they are often unable to bring persons in default of payments before the court for examination. Presently, probation officers must be college graduates, but the committee sees no reason why the collection of arrearages must be the responsibility of a probation officer. The courts could just as easily appoint a referee with power to issue subpoenas, take testimony, and administer oaths for the taking of testimony and the transcription of testimony with recommendations to the court as to the disposition of those cases brought before it for rehear-

ing. The probation department could appoint collection investigators who are graduates of high school to investigate arrearages of payments resulting from court orders, consent orders, and voluntary agreements of deserting, legally separated, or putative fathers with children on ADC, or of such children who might become charges on ADC.

Confusion also exists between courts and judges as to the amounts fathers should be charged for the support of their children upon divorce, legal separation, or from parents located and apprehended for the desertion and abandonment of their families. Here the committee concerned itself only to those cases which have come under its purview due to the receipt of public assistance, or the possible future need of public assistance through ADC. Where a child or children are, or are likely to become public charges due to the divorce or separation of their parents, this committee sees no reason why a goodly portion of all earned net income of such fathers should not be committed by mandatory statutory provisions for the support of such child or children until such time as they are no longer in need of public assistance. Minimum support orders create an easy license to establish a separate maintenance free from all familial responsibilities and family care, and contribute to the spiraling costs of ADC.

No estimate can safely be made as to the numbers of ADC families currently on assistance who might never have been in need had parents been compelled to support their children commensurately to their maximum earning capacity. As long as such conditions prevail we can expect an ever increasing burden to fall upon ADC for the support of neglected and abandoned children.

ILLEGITIMACY AND ADC

Next to desertions, illegitimacy ranks a close second as the next greatest cause of child dependency in New Jersey. Behind the veil of illegitimacy lies the more basic, but less spectacular problem of family breakdown affecting not only individuals, but whole groups of people. Entire families are blighted. Here we find the lowest level of parental responsibility—a social disease as lethal as any contagious disease, often passed on from one generation to the next.

The real problem of illegitimacy is not the offending parents of the illegitimate child. The insoluble problem is how to provide for the illegitimate child. Even more disturbing are the number of mothers who, in flagrant and ostentatious disregard of marriage and social custom, continue to bear illegitimate child after child without social or moral remorse as to the consequences to the children or their impact on society. The cost of supporting these women and their illegitimate children is staggering. The cost to the children and the perpetuation of those social evils begetting illegitimacy cannot be calculated.

Statistics on illegitimacy and ADC in New Jersey need not be distinguished from other States. They tell their own dramatic story. In New Jersey there were 6,573 families receiving assistance in December 1961 due to the birth of illegitimate children, the aggregate number of such children amounted to 13,773.⁷⁰ Equal to desertions as a cause for dependency, illegitimacy in New Jersey shows every indication of soon becoming the primary cause of child dependency in the ADC program.

In some cases illegitimacy resulted from a continuing relationship with one man who had never performed the legal formalities of marriage, but a greater number of these mothers have had as many as four, five, and six children born out of wedlock with the same number of different putative fathers involved. Apparently, this increase in illegitimacy occurs among females for whom an

⁶⁷ N.J.S.A. 9:6-10.

⁶⁸ N.J.S.A. 9:6-11.

⁶⁹ N.J.S.A. 9:6-9.

⁷⁰ 1961 biennial report.

illegitimate child does not create great social or emotional risks. In the majority of cases reviewed by the committee these mothers came from the lowest economic strata of our society; where housing is overcrowded, employment opportunities limited, and family relationships unstable.

Many of these women disclosed a complete lack of moral values, having little regard for the illegitimate status of their children, or the fact that the children were aware of their mother's immoral behavior. Reviewing these cases, one would believe that New Jersey had failed to enact statutory laws prohibiting fornication and adultery. Even more surprising is the fact that few of these women and their paramours have ever been brought before a court for filiation proceedings or prosecution.

The fact that a woman has an illegitimate child which is likely to become a public charge and where filiation proceedings have been instituted, such proceedings cannot, under present law, be considered a condition precedent nor a deterrent to the granting of assistance or relief.⁶¹ According to Federal Interpretation of the Social Security Act, a State may not deny assistance to any child because of some condition incidental to its birth. However, where filiation proceedings are instituted, upon trial or appeal to a county court, the mother of an illegitimate child can be compelled to disclose the name of the father, and upon refusal to do so may be adjudged in contempt of court.⁶² When a court finds that a person is the father of an illegitimate child, it may specify a sum to be paid weekly by the father or otherwise for the child's support, as well as the manner of payment.⁶³ When adjudged to be the father he is compelled to give bond to the State of New Jersey in an amount determined by the court with sufficient surety or cash security conditioned that he will obey and comply with the order of filiation. Compliance means the indemnification of the State and every county and municipality which may have incurred or may thereafter incur any expense for the support of the illegitimate child.⁶⁴ Such bond when recorded has the force and effect of a recognizance, and becomes a lien on all property of the reputed father until canceled. Failure to pay the sum ordered is a breach of the conditions of the bond, and the money collected on the bond must be paid to the State, county, or municipality which may have incurred expenses in supporting the illegitimate child or the mother during her confinement.⁶⁵

As regards filiation proceedings and support agreements, the experience of our judges of the juvenile and domestic relations courts concisely describe typical situations uncovered by the committee. The following testimony of Judge Martin Kole of the Bergen County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court on illegitimacy cases is illustrative:

"I can recall cases in my court of mothers of illegitimate children who are doing a fairly decent job in raising them. On the other hand, I can recall situations where the mother was obviously a bad influence for the children and should have been separated from them. I am aware of cases in my court where even in the case of legitimate children, the mother wanted the father breadwinner out of the house because she obtained more by ADC. And I also have had paternity cases before me where it seemed fairly clear that the pattern of illegitimate births established by the woman had at least not been discouraged by the prospect of receiving

ADC. I had one case involving one mother, three illegitimate children, and three separate putative fathers.

"Illegitimate children are, of course, a social, and moral problem much broader than the ADC program. However, there is no doubt that illegitimate children do create a substantial financial burden on the problem in our county—Bergen County. In Bergen County, illegitimacy ranks second as a cause of dependency under the program, second only to desertion of a parent. Of the 483 families on the rolls in 1961, 193 were dependent because of the desertion of a parent, 162 because of illegitimacy. This compares with 76 illegitimate children and 35 unwed mothers in 1960. The approximate cost of supporting the 162 illegitimate children and 52 unwed mothers in 1961 was \$12,500 per month."⁶⁶

More disturbing to the committee than any other facet of its investigation into relief was the impact of illegitimacy on ADC. Benefits paid through ADC grants in excess of \$400 and \$500 per month to women who have had 8, 9, and 10 illegitimate children with as many different putative fathers arouses public indignation, and validates public criticisms of ADC. Illegitimacy permeates the whole fabric of the ADC program and tends to corrupt, subvert, and defeat its very purposes.

It is not reasonable to expect the average person of normal sensibilities to sit idly by while public moneys are used to subsidize the immorality of a relatively small minority of our population.

A brief review of some typical family groups in this category indicates the seriousness of the problem as well as the unwholesome environment in which these unfortunate illegitimate children must live.

Miss A. is an illegitimate child. She has had eight illegitimate children by seven different men. Her oldest daughter has an illegitimate child. Their home is dirty and infested. She and her children and grandchild all receive ADC payments. Her income amounts to \$218 from ADC, and \$87 from private domestic work. She also receives income from the putative father of two of her children. She currently has a new boyfriend who also supplies her with money which is not known to the social case worker.

Mrs. B.'s husband deserted about 7 years ago, and she has been on relief since then. She had had seven children, three of which are illegitimate by three different putative fathers. Her mother was also on relief, and her brother is the father of an illegitimate child. Both mother and child are also collecting ADC. Mrs. B.'s monthly grant is \$294.

Miss C. has four illegitimate children fathered by two different putative fathers. She is an admitted prostitute and habitual shoplifter, and despite the fact that her record indicates that the case worker recommends the children be removed, she still retains their custody and receives a monthly grant of \$149.

Miss D. has three illegitimate children fathered by two different putative fathers. One of whom is also the father of three more illegitimate children by another woman also on ADC in the same city. Miss D.'s father has two wives, one with eight children receiving ADC in one county, and the other with two children also on ADC in another county. Her sister is also receiving ADC as a result of the birth of an illegitimate child.

Mrs. E. was deserted by her husband who left her with three children. She subsequently had seven illegitimate children. Now, four of her daughters have a total of eight illegitimate children. This family received over \$14,000 in ADC benefits over a period of 17 months.

Miss F. has four illegitimate children fathered by four different putative fathers. She has a police record for shoplifting and neglect of her children.

Many women on ADC have accepted illegitimacy as a way of life with no thought or intention of ever establishing a family home influenced by the guidance and support of a husband. And such conditions prevail without any apparent fear of social or legal retribution. Some, when threatened with the loss of custody of their legitimate or illegitimate offspring couldn't care less, but their concern was soon evident when realization took place that loss of the children also meant loss of all ADC income.

Typical of such cases was Miss G whose background and testimony follows:

"Miss G has 14 illegitimate children by 8 different putative fathers. Five children are in foster homes. One is deceased and three are supported by their fathers. She has a police record, and four of the eight putative fathers of her children also have police records. She lives in a four-room apartment and pays \$60 a month rent.

"Her parents came to New Jersey from Virginia in 1927, and went on relief in 1933. Her first child was born when she was 12 years old, and she has been on welfare most of her life. Her minor child, now living with her had an illegitimate child also at age of 12, and is now pregnant with another illegitimate child. The putative father of this illegitimate grandchild is in the State prison. Miss G's budget will be increased shortly to provide for the new illegitimate grandchild after it is born. From February 1, 1943, to February 1, 1961, Miss G. has received total relief payments of \$62,650.70. Miss G, her illegitimate children and grandchildren are still on relief, and there appears no possibility that this family can ever be rehabilitated."

Miss G. was questioned by the committee as to her reasons for having one illegitimate child after another. As often happened before the committee when mothers of illegitimate children were asked this question, the committee received no response, or when answers were given they were consistently irresponsible. Almost in every case, and with few exceptions, the witnesses showed no remorse for the results of their immorality, and seemed to care little about the impact of illegitimate children on society, and upon the child itself.

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Tell me, you've had 14 children, starting in 1935, and your last child was born in July of 1959. At no time during this period have you had any money or any prospect of getting any money to support these children, have you?"

Answer. "Well, every time—I could always get a job, I mean, days work or something like that, but I just don't have no one I can depend on to leave the children with."

Question. "That is exactly what I mean. I mean at all times you knew that you were unable to work; you knew that you had no money, but you went right on having these illegitimate children, is that right?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "How do you account for that?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "Do you think there is anything wrong about it or do you think it was fair to the taxpayer to support all of these illegitimate children here?"

Answer. "No. I don't think it was fair."

Question. "But you have been doing it for 24 years; right?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "You went to jail for neglect of some of your children, is that so?"

Answer. "Yes."

Question. "How long did you stay in jail?"

Answer. "Eighteen months, I believe."

⁶¹ NJSA 9:17-2.

⁶² NJSA 9:17-11.

⁶³ NJSA 9:17-12.

⁶⁴ NJSA 9:17-14.

⁶⁵ NJSA 9:17-17-18.

⁶⁶ Fifth public hearing, vol. 2 (June 22, 1962) Atlantic City, N.J.

Question. "You had a child while you were in jail?"

Answer. "That's right."

Question. "Do you think that there is anything wrong morally for you to have child after child without being married?"

Answer. (No response.)

Question. "How do you feel about that, or doesn't it bother you?"

Answer. "Sure it worries me."

Question. "Why is that nowhere along the line did you marry any of these men who fathered your children?"

Answer. "Well, I could have been married one time, but I figured it wouldn't be any getting along because it wasn't the father of the kids, the father of my children. So I didn't get married."

Question. "Did you have these children deliberately? Did you try to get yourself pregnant because that would mean more money to you by way of relief?"

Answer. "No, because I worked up until I—you know, I just wasn't making enough money to support the kids, but I had worked. I have done days work. I was doing them even when they put me on the State * * * and I was on relief, I was working."

All circumstances involved with this family would indicate that the chain of dependency cannot be broken except by the removal of the children, and especially the removal of new-born infants at the earliest possible time.

It is obvious that the circumstances surrounding these children are such as to provide an immoral environment which directly contributes to the continued delinquency, demoralization and dependency of this group as a family unit. For the best interests of the children involved, plans should be made for their immediate removal so that they, although illegitimate, will at least have an opportunity to rise above the stigma of illegitimacy, and become responsible, independent and contributing members of society.

Another case investigated by the committee is illustrative of this chain of illegitimacy and continued dependency from one generation to the next:

Mrs. H lives with four of her nine children in a large urban community. She and two of her children are receiving ADC. Also living with her are seven grandchildren, also receiving ADC. Two other daughters and their children who are not living with Mrs. H also receive ADC relief. Five of Mrs. H's children are illegitimate. All 14 of her grandchildren are illegitimate. One daughter has eight illegitimate children, another has two, and another, four. Today there is a total of 22 living children. Fifteen of these children have been born outside the State of New Jersey. Case files reveal a list of at least 10 putative fathers, 6 of whom were never in New Jersey, 3 of whom are dead, with the fathers of 2 children listed as unknown, and the whereabouts of 2 are unknown.

At the time of the committee's investigation, this family was receiving a total of \$949 per month; \$876 from the county welfare department, and an additional \$93 as social security benefits. Mrs. H states she can't do with the money she gets, and that the welfare board is going to put two additional younger children on the welfare rolls. She pays \$120 a month for a six-room apartment and supplies her own heat and utilities.

Born in St. Augustine, Fla., in 1905, at the time of this investigation she was 55 years old. Formerly a resident of Georgia, she moved to New Jersey in 1951.

"Third private hearing, Aug. 8, 1961, Newark, N.J."

Total expenditures from all agencies for this family for the period commencing 1954 through 1960 totals \$42,525.40, including county welfare grants for the first 3 months of 1961, but not including social security benefits of \$93 a month.

This family of three generations gives every indication that unless the children are removed, we will be called upon to provide ADC for a fourth generation of illegitimate children.

These families represent more than mere cases of immorality and incorrigibility. They concern the welfare and future character of children raised in homes where normal standards of morality and family responsibility are absent. The concern of the committee is not only the waste of public funds, but the protection of these children from their irresponsible parents and the unwholesome environment in which they are living at public expense.

To protect both innocent children born out of wedlock from the flagrancy and iniquity of their home environs, and the interests of the general public is a duty of paramount concern to all responsible people. Regardless of increased costs of institutional care or foster home care, these children cry aloud for help to escape their wicked environment. Their immediate removal must be expedited if we are ever to break the chain effect of illegitimacy and future child-family dependency on ADC.

Striking in its denunciation of such relief practices was the recent report of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Essex County addressed to the freeholders of that county:

"It is costing Essex County taxpayers millions of dollars for welfare relief. Most of the recipients come within the category of deserving recipients. However, hundreds of thousands of dollars are being handed out each year to mothers who, in no sense of the word, are deserving. The out-of-wedlock children of those mothers, to be sure, must be fed, clothed, and housed, but day after day, in the domestic relations court, unblushing, unmarried mothers admit they are getting welfare relief for anywhere up to 8, 9, and even 10 out-of-wedlock children. One such mother is getting \$464 a month—this totals \$5,568 a year. This is more than many married men, working for the county, are being paid.

"The situation mentioned is brought into sharp focus when the county welfare board tracks down the fathers of these out-of-wedlock children and files complaints against them for support, seeking court order in sufficient amount to take the children off the relief rolls.

"Many outrageous facts are disclosed at the court hearings. Welfare recipients with children by four or five different men. Fathers who have several broods on welfare relief. Fathers married and not supporting their legitimate wife and children. Fathers who shrug their shoulders in disdain of the whole proceedings and in effect say—'I am not making enough money to support them—let the taxpayers do it.'"

The cases under discussion represent illegitimacy in ADC at its worst. For the most part these are hard core, chronic cases which will continue to beget more illegitimate children at public expense unless some new methods are developed to combat and contain this group, with emphasis on legal punitive measures in addition to psychiatric and psychological counseling. In seeking some answers to this complex problem, the

"Lindeman and Bellfatto, J. 'Problems Presented in the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court' (1961).

committee heard testimony from Judge Harry W. Lindeman, coauthor of the above-cited report and Judge of the Essex County Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court.

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Judge, we just wanted to hear your views on what, if anything, can be done about this situation. We have run into cases of women with 7, 8, 9, and as high as 10 illegitimate children by 6, 7, or 8 different fathers, some known and some unknown. From your experience, what is wrong with this program, if anything? What can we do with it?"

Answer. "I have a definite opinion that the mother of every out-of-wedlock child should register with an agency, either a private agency or a public agency, for the purpose of getting some social help on the basic proposition that out-of-wedlock children generally are bad for any community and particularly bad for the child. So in the first instance, I think they should register and social services should be made available to them.

"Then, I think, if there should be a second out-of-wedlock child, that there should be some provision that that mother and father—let me say that rather definitely too—that the mother and father be brought into court. Then the court with an investigation by the probation department or some other agency that may have had the case determines whether or not that mother should be in such an institution as Clinton Reformatory where they have a splendid program for out-of-wedlock mothers or should be maybe in the county penitentiary where they also have a program, or, if it is a younger person, perhaps the State home for girls if it is a younger teenager so that they can get some social help because I presume Judge Kole told you of cases where there are 4, 5, 6, 7, 8—I have had them as many as 9—receiving up to \$500 a month, receiving in support more than some of the county employees get. No child, illegitimate or otherwise should be denied food, clothing, or shelter. But many mothers of these children actually in my opinion are not deserving of the help they get because through inadequacy or otherwise they don't comprehend what is going on. They sit in court with one, two, or three different fathers for their several children and they say they are getting public support and that is as far as it goes, with no conscious desire, at least expressed not to have a fifth, sixth, seventh, or eighth.

I have definitely warned everyone with multiple out-of-wedlock children and I put it in the record, that if they have an additional one, I am going to direct the probation department or some other agency to file a complaint for neglect against that mother on the grounds that every additional child is neglecting the children they already have and under R.S. 9: 6-1, and so forth, which is the welfare statute, it says that one of the basis for neglect is where a child is or is likely to become a public charge by reason of the conduct of the parent. While that might seem to be technical, it is not technical when you consider the total social impact of three, four, five out-of-wedlock children and nothing done to acquaint that mother with her social responsibilities and with the tremendous impact of illegitimacy on the child itself who among its peers as it grows up in school has a terrifically hard time to live down that there is no father in the picture.

"I have worked out a form⁶⁶ whereby * * * many fathers are brought into court sign this form where they admit paternity * * * which is filed with the central bureau

⁶⁶ See appendix, this report.

of statistics at Trenton, available only to . . . welfare department people, or those who have an interest in it. This is in the nature of prima facie evidence of paternity . . .

"I would say that in Essex County the vast majority of the people who come there for relief are entitled to it. But those are not the kind who come before me. . . . We don't want to deny in Essex County a person relief and proper and adequate relief. But there is a certain core where taxpayers' money is used where I think that there is a special obligation, not only to see that it is spent wisely, but I am advocating that there is an obligation to go into that home to see that the money that goes there, which is taxpayers' money, is also spent for the benefit of the family. I get too many cases where numbers of mothers of illegitimate children spend the first few days after the money comes in spending it. I advocate that no relief be given to those where the check is endorsed at a tavern. . . . Somebody has to suffer because it is a relief budget so somebody is bound to suffer. It is my opinion that there is one of the loopholes that ought to be looked into."⁷⁰

Of all the recommendations and suggestions made to this committee regarding illegitimate children of mothers on relief, none have been more uniform and cogent than those advocated by every county welfare director who had opportunity to testify before the committee. Typical of this testimony is that of Raymond Dougherty, director of the Mercer County Welfare Board.

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "One of the things the committee has under consideration as a possible recommendation—and we'd like to have your expert opinion as to whether you think that this would act as a deterrent—is that a separate organization be set up within the prosecutor's office whose staff would have nothing else to do except to follow through on deserting fathers and pressing complaints against putative fathers in order to force them to support the children or bring them back to justice, that if that were done, that might be a curb on the men, at least."

Answer. "I would like to see that."

Question. "Of course, the other is that shelters be set up. And I think you made mention of the fact that in some instances you recommend that the children be taken away and put out in foster homes."

Answer. "That's right."

Question. "So those two things together—would that in your opinion act as an effective curb on this condition?"

Answer. "I think that's a very good plan and I think that we would work wholeheartedly with the prosecutor's office, which we do now. But as I pointed out, there are so many of these desertions and absentee fathers, that they just can't handle them all and it's quite a job. They don't have the staff."⁷¹

Again, similar means were advocated by welfare director, Joseph Greene of Passaic County:

"Some steps should be taken and instead of penalizing the children, there should be legislation permitting welfare boards to allocate shelters on a private basis whereby if we have a family or a woman having one, two, three, four, and five . . . well, whereby welfare boards, in cases of that kind where there is misconduct and the morale of the house is very low, be permitted to take these children out of the home temporarily and

place them in private shelters and pay them a fee worthwhile for them to go into the business themselves.

"Unfortunately, I might add this also, at present that type of case under your present regulations and law you should refer to the State board of child welfare which has charge of care and foster care. Well, you know the situation, and I am not blaming them. They have their hands full. We get 4 or 5 kids or 10 families for placement in foster homes. They can't do it. It is humanly impossible, but if the law were amended and regulations made whereby county welfare boards might open these places—

"But with this type of shelter, they can go to school and they are associating with other children. The important factor is that in this home, instead of four walls for an institutional program they have somewhat of a home life and there is a possibility that the kindness of the person running this place might be instilled in that kid, so that by the time he gets home he will at least know what it is to be in surroundings that a child is entitled to.

"We cannot do that now, for, if we were to establish that on a county level, we would have to bear the freight; I again say 'we' meaning the county. I think that that will answer the problem a great deal, and, if the State would share on that cost, we could turn around when we appear in court in a case of that kind and point out or recommend to the court that the mother be sent away for 30 or 60 days and we will provide for the children. I mean temporarily only. I don't want to take any child away from a parent, no matter how bad the conditions are at home—a child is still a child and the love of the parent always exists."⁷²

That the public has become acutely aware and concerned by the danger of continued illegitimacy and the wanton abandonment of moral values by mothers on relief is illustrated by the following editorial appearing in the Newark Evening News on August 11, 1961, immediately following disclosures made by this committee after one of its hearings on illegitimacy in Essex County:

"Deeper than dollars—

"The legislature's investigation of New Jersey welfare policies is turning up disquieting facts about the aid to dependent children program. Senator Grossi of Passaic, chairman of the investigating committee, reports that one Essex County woman and her 14 illegitimate children, sired by 10 different fathers, have cost public welfare agencies nearly \$62,000 in the last 18 years.

"Another case involves three generations with 23 children, 15 of them illegitimate, which has received more than \$42,000 in 7 years. The family currently receives \$876 in welfare grants, plus \$93 in social security benefits.

"Presented here is the perennial dilemma that incorrigibility presents to compassion. The question goes deeper than dollars. It concerns the welfare and the future character of children being reared in homes where normal standards of morality and family responsibility are absent.

"Society has always asserted the right to remove children from the custody of unfit parents. But the ADC program as it must be administered under existing law reverses this policy and perpetuates unwholesome environments for the young.

"As the chairman of the Essex County Welfare Board says, the legislative investigation is in the public interest because it is 'bringing to light problems the public generally does not realize have existed . . . the way

you get things corrected is with public interest.'

"Clearly here is an area where correction is needed, not primarily to prevent waste of public money, but to protect children from irresponsible parents."

There are good reasons for such alarm. This committee has been deluged by similar editorials and other news articles published throughout the entire State demanding reforms in the present administration of the ADC program in New Jersey.

Those who advocate the virtues of the ADC program, must also admonish it for the large number of illegitimate children bred in unwholesome environments sustained solely on income from ADC benefits. These children, thrust into sinful environments from birth through their most formative and impressive years, soon learn to adapt to the amoral environment of their home, adopting the ways and attitudes of their mother. Sooner or later, these children themselves, will present the same and other problems to society.

Caseworkers and those involved in the administration of ADC sincerely believe that the best and most satisfactory place for a child is with its mother, where at least some token of natural parental love and affection may be provided. The committee does not desire to refute this laudable objective, but many times in their desire to maintain these often unstable and unsatisfying mother-child relationships, they lose sight of the child's inherent rights as a human being to grow in a world free from great moral risks and harm. We believe that continued and repeated cases of illegitimate births is prima facie and conclusive evidence of a mother's unfitness to provide proper care for her family, and such children should be removed for their own protection and for the protection of society.

New Jersey has long recognized the rights of the child as the dominant factor in determining the custody and care of children, and the rights of parents to their children's custody cannot prevail if it imperils the personal safety, morals, health or happiness of the children. The welfare of the children is the paramount consideration, and to this principle even parental rights must yield.

These family situations demand remedial care far beyond the framework of continued ADC casework within the home. These mothers must be remanded to a public institution for as much time as may be required for their rehabilitation and further evaluation as to their fitness to resume a future home environment for their children. We must be willing to assume the added costs of caring for these children, at least temporarily, with foster care or institutional care as compared to home life assistance under ADC. We must also recognize that complete removal of children from their mothers will not be enough. To merely remove the children will give a greater freedom to the mother than she had perhaps ever known since the birth of her first illegitimate child and subsequent dependency on ADC. In short, termination of parental relationships must not act as a reward, or incentive to carry on further illicit relationships with foreknowledge that the results of such relationships will be borne as a public responsibility.

One alternative may be the establishment of child care centers where children may be given care for temporary periods of 60 to 90 days during which time the mother can be committed to jail as a repressive measure and as an opportunity of isolating both mother and children for a temporary period to permit psychological and psychiatric counselling. Release of the mother should be conditioned on terms determined by the court to provide

⁷⁰ Fifth public hearing (June 22, 1962) vol. 2, Atlantic City, N.J.

⁷¹ Fourth public hearing (Feb. 2, 1962), Trenton, N.J.

⁷² Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.

for adequate care of the children when the father to carry out conditions imposed by the mother returns to maintain her home. Recourt should result in a permanent removal of the children, and a sentence of commitment.

We feel these steps are necessary because the immorality which surrounds the conception of additional illegitimate children cannot be ignored; not as to its effect upon the children, their future welfare, their concept of family life, their evaluation of what is normal and abnormal, nor the damaging impression that ADC is a way of life which provides freedom from all care while the public endlessly provides for their every need.

RESIDENCY

In May of 1959, the ADC program as we know it today was transferred from State administration to the county welfare boards through appropriate legislation.

On January 1, 1960, this legislation became effective. The 1 year residency requirement formerly in effect for eligibility for ADC was abolished. This legislation was motivated by a humanitarian desire to provide immediate aid to children and their mothers when found in need, regardless of their circumstances or how long they had resided or had settlement in the State of New Jersey. The removal of all residency requirements for ADC, though laudable, has proven economically unsound and impractical.

Its impracticality arises from the fact that there is no uniformity in the amount of grants paid under ADC throughout the various States. Another important factor is that the majority of all other States maintain strict residency requirements before eligibility for ADC can be established. Many States, even after eligibility for ADC has been established, limit the amount of grants to statutory maximums far below grants re-

ceived by families of comparable size on ADC in New Jersey. For instance, Florida has a maximum statutory limitation of only \$81 per month per family; Delaware has a maximum statutory limitation of \$150 per month regardless of the size of families or relative need. Other States have set maximum grants by regulation rather than statute. Tennessee pays a monthly maximum of \$96; South Carolina, \$99; Arkansas, \$105; Alabama, \$124; Georgia, \$124; Louisiana, \$141; West Virginia, \$165; New Mexico, \$170; Arizona, \$173; Wyoming, \$180; Oklahoma, \$197; Maine, \$225; Washington, \$275.⁷³

New Jersey has no maximum on monthly grants paid through ADC, but the September 1962 average family monthly grant was \$175.16. The individual grant averaged \$47.56 per person. But those States which have placed maximum grants such as Maine with \$225 per month and Washington with \$275 per month had average monthly grants per family of \$104.93 and \$154.01 per month, respectively. New Jersey is a leading State according to average size of family grants, exceeded only by New York at \$183.92 and Illinois at \$198.12. However, in average grant per recipient, New Jersey leads all other States.⁷⁴

When the factors of easy eligibility, generous benefits, and complete absence of residency requirements are considered together with the fact that mass ecological changes have occurred from migrations of people from the Southern States to the more populous and industrial urban centers of the Northeast, the effects on our ADC and other assistance programs have not been minimized.

⁷³ U.S. Department of HEW payments to recipients by States (Nov. 8, 1962).

⁷⁴ U.S. Department of HEW Social Security Administration payments to recipients by States (Nov. 8, 1962).

Today, transportation from one State to another is both inexpensive and easy to accomplish contributing to the influx of new families and individuals into New Jersey looking for better employment opportunities and living conditions not always available in less industrialized States. Most of these people are laborers and itinerant migratory farm and domestic workers. They consist of the unskilled labor force which always feels the immediate effects of any economic recession, large or small, often becoming dependent on public welfare for assistance, usually for entire families. These groups represent families with the most difficult problems of adjustment which may result in long-term chronic dependency involving casework far beyond the capabilities of our present existing resources.

Of further significance is the fact that Federal participation in aid under ADC in New Jersey is far less percentage-wise than similar participation made under ADC programs to other States. For instance of the total grants made to recipients in Alabama, the Federal Government paid 82.3 percent, the State paid 17.6 percent, and local funds paid 0.1 percent.⁷⁵

Comparatively, New Jersey receives approximately 44.1 percent from the Federal Government, with the State and counties equally contributing 56 percent.

This relatively smaller amount of Federal participation received by New Jersey under the ADC program is more reason why New Jersey should not be placed in a position of caring for needy families that should be the responsibility of the State from which they have migrated.

⁷⁵ U.S. Department of HEW Social Security Administration expenditures by source of funds (May 18, 1962).

NOTE.—Includes medical vendor payments. See also complete table by States.

Aid to dependent children: Expenditures for assistance to recipients, by source of funds, calendar year ended Dec. 31, 1961

[Amounts in thousands]

State	Total assistance, including vendor payments for medical care	Total, including vendor payments for medical care						State	Total assistance, including vendor payments for medical care	Total, including vendor payments for medical care					
		Federal funds		State funds		Local funds				Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent			Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
Total.....	\$1,228,222	\$713,375	58.1	\$390,932	31.8	\$123,915	10.1	Missouri.....	\$29,434	\$21,730	73.8	\$7,703	26.2		
Alabama.....	10,464	8,608	82.3	1,846	17.6	9	.1	Montana.....	2,953	1,843	62.4	839	28.4	\$272	9.2
Alaska.....	1,657	1,011	61.0	646	39.0			Nebraska.....	4,423	3,165	71.6	1,236	27.9	22	.5
Arizona.....	12,531	9,438	75.3	3,093	24.7			Nevada.....	1,568	1,081	68.9	488	31.1		
Arkansas.....	5,058	4,145	82.0	913	18.0			New Hampshire.....	2,100	1,100	52.4	1,000	47.6		
California.....	173,872	75,023	43.1	68,936	39.6	29,913	17.2	New Jersey.....	36,015	15,871	44.1	10,072	28.0	10,072	28.0
Colorado.....	12,529	7,842	62.6	2,208	17.6	2,479	19.8	New Mexico.....	11,737	8,198	69.8	3,539	30.2		
Connecticut.....	18,222	7,825	42.9	10,397	57.1			New York.....	164,831	77,857	47.2	43,933	26.7	43,042	26.1
Delaware.....	2,113	1,583	74.9	265	12.5	265	12.5	North Carolina.....	27,356	21,712	79.4	3,113	11.4	2,531	9.3
District of Columbia.....	9,897	6,032	60.9	3,865	39.1			North Dakota.....	3,415	1,895	55.5	1,212	35.5	308	9.0
Florida.....	17,714	14,588	82.4	3,126	17.6			Ohio.....	44,956	30,144	67.1	11,346	25.2	3,466	7.7
Georgia.....	16,824	13,055	77.6	3,096	18.4	673	4.0	Oklahoma.....	27,490	18,639	67.8	8,851	32.2		
Guam.....	131	66	50.0	66	50.0			Oregon.....	12,637	6,199	49.1	4,507	35.7	1,931	15.3
Hawaii.....	4,279	2,538	59.3	1,740	40.7			Pennsylvania.....	94,883	62,604	66.0	32,279	34.0		
Idaho.....	4,297	2,357	54.9	1,940	45.1			Puerto Rico.....	10,334	4,783	46.3	5,551	53.7		
Illinois.....	94,976	46,394	48.8	48,582	51.2			Rhode Island.....	8,882	4,716	53.1	4,166	46.9		
Indiana.....	15,251	10,629	69.7	2,773	18.2			South Carolina.....	6,393	5,265	82.4	1,128	17.6		
Iowa.....	15,392	9,514	61.8	2,939	19.1	2,939	19.1	South Dakota.....	3,970	2,888	72.7	1,082	27.3		
Kansas.....	11,072	6,514	58.8	2,193	19.8	2,365	21.4	Tennessee.....	18,860	15,229	80.7	2,904	15.4	726	3.9
Kentucky.....	22,269	17,211	77.3	5,058	22.7			Texas.....	17,530	14,138	80.7	3,392	19.3		
Louisiana.....	25,565	19,798	77.4	5,767	22.6			Utah.....	6,638	3,966	60.1	2,651	39.9		
Maine.....	6,823	5,170	75.8	800	11.7	853	12.5	Vermont.....	1,693	1,238	73.1	305	18.0	150	8.9
Maryland.....	15,509	10,599	68.3	4,122	26.6	788	5.1	Virgin Islands.....	190	94	49.6	96	50.4		
Massachusetts.....	31,397	13,762	43.8	10,466	33.3	7,169	22.8	Virginia.....	12,185	9,320	76.5	1,703	14.0	1,162	9.5
Michigan.....	47,416	25,893	54.6	19,703	41.6	1,819	3.8	Washington.....	25,025	11,914	47.6	13,112	52.4		
Minnesota.....	20,322	9,684	47.7	5,421	26.7	5,217	25.7	West Virginia.....	21,683	20,831	96.0	6,713	23.6	3	(²)
Mississippi.....	8,893	7,321	82.3	1,572	17.7			Wisconsin.....	18,533	8,771	47.3	6,183	33.4	3,579	19.3
								Wyoming.....	1,322	713	53.9	297	22.5	313	23.5

¹ Amount less than 50 percent because for the fiscal year 1961 half of the total expenditures exceeded the statutory limitation on the aggregate amount of Federal funds for all programs that can be made available for a fiscal year under present legislation;

accordingly expenditures from Federal funds comprised less than half the total for the period January-June 1961.

² Less than 0.05 percent.

Aid to families with dependent children: Recipients and payments to recipients, by State, September 1962¹ (includes vendor payments for medical care and cases receiving only such payments)

State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients			State	Number of families	Number of recipients		Payments to recipients		
				Total amount	Average per—						Total amount	Average per—	
		Total ²	Children		Family	Recipient			Total ²	Children		Family	Recipient
Total ³	925,179	3,633,155	2,810,053	\$114,373,330	\$123.62	\$31.48	Missouri	26,552	104,024	79,572	\$2,533,746	\$95.43	\$24.36
Alabama	21,832	88,597	69,588	987,032	45.21	11.14	Montana	1,846	7,170	5,599	244,287	132.33	34.07
Alaska	1,226	4,257	3,214	133,888	109.21	31.45	Nebraska	3,211	12,771	9,904	376,677	117.31	29.49
Arizona	9,169	37,923	29,339	1,128,151	123.04	29.75	Nevada	1,215	4,440	3,563	131,381	108.13	29.59
Arkansas	6,092	23,322	17,954	378,697	62.16	16.24	New Hampshire	983	3,930	3,020	162,120	164.92	41.25
California ⁴	86,183	325,391	250,278	14,263,843	165.51	43.84	New Jersey	21,527	70,277	60,489	3,770,759	175.16	47.56
Colorado	8,908	34,655	27,329	1,220,104	136.97	35.21	New Mexico ⁴	7,358	29,031	22,459	913,045	124.09	31.45
Connecticut ³	11,142	40,795	30,916	1,898,060	170.35	46.53	New York ¹	86,380	358,294	275,816	15,887,353	183.92	44.34
Delaware ¹	1,907	8,048	6,309	173,761	91.12	21.59	North Carolina ¹	26,857	106,152	82,313	2,352,877	87.61	22.17
District of Columbia	4,615	21,264	17,025	700,040	151.69	32.92	North Dakota	1,743	6,610	5,189	270,558	155.23	40.93
Florida	26,871	100,419	80,327	1,675,603	62.36	16.69	Ohio	35,578	141,843	108,705	4,145,592	116.52	29.23
Georgia	16,282	60,988	47,398	1,411,573	86.70	23.15	Oklahoma ¹	18,752	68,871	52,707	2,326,429	124.06	33.78
Guam	175	922	765	11,259	64.34	12.21	Oregon ¹	7,303	26,940	20,553	1,024,011	140.22	38.01
Hawaii ²	3,074	12,645	10,100	459,440	149.46	36.33	Pennsylvania ¹	69,027	280,367	214,488	9,008,266	130.50	32.13
Idaho	2,448	9,353	6,948	387,822	158.42	41.46	Puerto Rico	57,044	228,604	184,021	837,707	14.69	3.66
Illinois ¹	58,597	254,815	199,635	11,608,974	198.12	45.56	Rhode Island ¹	5,027	19,090	14,567	774,948	154.16	40.59
Indiana ¹	12,306	46,827	35,678	1,326,436	107.79	28.33	South Carolina	8,328	33,406	26,696	480,396	57.68	14.38
Iowa	10,232	38,473	29,170	1,484,993	145.13	38.60	South Dakota	2,828	10,045	7,662	314,066	111.06	31.27
Kansas	6,636	25,781	20,542	971,552	146.41	37.68	Tennessee	21,921	82,843	63,280	1,534,681	70.01	18.53
Kentucky	21,535	77,410	58,192	1,952,370	90.66	25.22	Texas	19,328	80,336	61,312	1,529,533	79.14	19.04
Louisiana ¹	21,844	89,705	69,966	2,166,554	99.18	24.15	Utah ¹	3,963	15,264	11,677	523,975	132.22	34.33
Maine	5,956	21,336	15,859	624,964	104.93	29.29	Vermont	1,327	4,776	3,580	144,529	108.91	30.26
Maryland ¹	12,180	51,723	40,934	1,633,116	134.08	31.57	Virgin Islands	314	1,079	907	17,583	56.00	16.30
Massachusetts ¹	19,230	67,242	50,648	3,124,404	162.48	46.47	Virginia ¹	10,396	42,599	33,501	1,031,074	99.18	24.20
Michigan	33,104	119,619	88,288	4,586,083	138.54	38.34	Washington	11,150	30,682	20,518	1,717,182	154.01	43.27
Minnesota	11,327	39,861	31,310	1,878,170	165.81	47.12	West Virginia ¹	30,442	120,949	93,920	3,441,888	113.06	28.46
Mississippi	20,299	79,890	62,829	726,863	35.81	9.10	Wisconsin ¹	10,827	40,490	31,146	1,853,423	171.19	45.77
							Wyoming	782	3,011	2,348	111,492	142.57	37.03

¹ For definition of terms see the Bulletin, October 1957, p. 18. All data subject to revision.

² Includes as recipients the children and 1 parent or other adult relative in families in which the requirements of at least 1 such adult were considered in determining the amount of assistance.

³ Includes data on aid to families with dependent children, unemployed parent segment; see table 6.

⁴ Includes data on foster-family care; see table 7.

But it is virtually impossible to ascertain with any degree of certainty or accuracy the impact on ADC of these disparities which exist between the several States. However, the majority of witnesses testifying before the committee indicated a preference for the reestablishment of residency requirements as well as some period of permanent employment in New Jersey prior to eligibility being granted for any form of public assistance. The following testimony by Mr. Sidney Adelman, director of public welfare for the city of Paterson, N.J., is illustrative:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Now, when does the field investigation start?"

Answer. "After the eligibility of the applicant is established, it is turned over to the investigator for a home visit."

Question. "When do the payments start?"

Answer. "Under the statute, it is supposed to start immediately. Our department is supposed to give, and investigate after. We are the only program that must give immediately without investigation."

Question. "Do you think that's a good policy?"

Answer. "Definitely not."

Question. "What would you suggest in place of it?"

Answer. "I would suggest that in order not to be in conflict with the bureau's plan with the Government, we have a plan filed which has been accepted by the social security administration. It is a matchable program. There should be a 30-day work record to indicate that the man has worked at least 30 days before he is eligible for relief, before his application is accepted, because there has been a tremendous amount of criticism by the public about the people who come here and get off a bus or a plane and walk into the relief department and demand relief immediately and you have to give it to them because the statute says that any person who is found to be in need must receive immediate aid. That statute should be revised, studied, or simplified * * *. As a member of the mayor's review commit-

tee, established in 1959, we went through all this and in 1960 the welfare directors of the six largest cities in the State seemed to be in accord with that opinion.

"Under the statute as it is now, the eligibility for relief is very simple, but it gives the commissioner of the department of institutions the authority under the statute to interpret how that statute shall be best applied, with the methods of procedures that are laid down by the commissioner who has the authority to lay down policy, and he may do it by policy."

Question. "What are the present standards of eligibility?"

Answer. "Well, a person must be in need and he must be examined as to whether or not he has any resources—any future resources or present resources. We also interview or contact relatives who under the statute are responsible relatives who could help the family."

Question. "That's all done after he's declared eligible?"

Answer. "He is eligible the minute he declares he's in need. He comes in the office and he says, 'I have no food, my children have no milk, you've got to take care of it.' Immediately you've got to put the fire out."

Question. "Have you during your tenure come across any cases that have come into Paterson from other States in the Union where it has developed that they came here specifically for the purpose of getting on relief?"

Answer. "Oh, yes. I had a woman here about 4 or 5 months ago. She went down South to one State down there and she brought up her daughter with four or five children, and I sent for this woman and I said, 'You brought your daughter up here for the purpose of getting relief.' She took her in her home—she was on relief herself, the mother. I said, 'You're going to go back, and if you don't go back I'm going to make a complaint against you.' Well, they haggled for about a week or 10 days, and she finally said, 'All right, we'll go back,' and we gave her \$25 for gas and oil and food and they went back.

Question. "Did it develop that they came to Paterson because Paterson was a so-called easy city to get relief out of?"

Answer. "That's right. Our relief program is considered one of the most generous programs in New Jersey. Down South they get \$7 a child and up here they get \$30 a child. It makes quite a difference. I have had them tell me that. They don't get enough down there. That's why I suggested the work program, and you'll find you will cut down the applications for relief from other States and they won't be bouncing in here so frequently."

Question. "Have you ever developed in questioning or interviewing a relief applicant that they came here to Paterson or New Jersey, as the case may be, because they were told down South, or wherever they came from that they could get more money on relief up here than they could down there?"

Answer. "Only from the person who made the application. I asked him, 'Why did you come here? They have a relief department down there too. They have to take care of you.' 'Well, down there, they only give you \$7.' The applicant told me that."

Until such time as some degree of uniformity has been achieved between the various States in size of grants and eligibility standards for relief assistance this committee believes that residency requirements must be reenacted by the legislature, not to deprive legitimate families found in need of assistance, but for the simple reason of self-protection against discriminating practices of other States which too often tend to encourage migration to States where welfare services and grants are more attractive. In the first 9 months following abolition of our residency requirements for ADC, 177 new cases were added who had less than 1 year residence in New Jersey. These cases become permanent relief cases and their number will grow each year.

¹⁶ Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961) Paterson, N.J.

HOUSING AND RENTS

Living conditions under which the average ADC recipient family lives were found inadequate and often lacking even elementary sanitation and health protection. Rents paid by ADC grants are unlimited and excessive. Evidence gathered by the committee substantially corroborates the fact that no control in rental payments exists, and that supervision and inspection of facilities rented by ADC recipients is almost nonexistent.

Many such facilities can best be described as hovels where rents are charged on a weekly basis, often exceeding \$100 per month.⁷⁷ Landlords consistently refuse to maintain minimum standards of decency and health. Unquestionably some specialize in buying slum properties at cheap prices and rent them exclusively to welfare clients at exorbitant rates. Local health inspectors try to enforce minimum housing standards, but are often overwhelmed by the sheer inertia of both landlord and tenants. Only the most flagrant violations are corrected, and then after periodic warnings and repeated threats of prosecution. Typical of these conditions is the testimony of a Passaic County detective who investigated some apartments rented by ADC clients and photographed the premises at the committee's request.⁷⁸

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Detective DiSimone, what is your position?"

Answer. "County detective, county of Passaic."

Question. "Now in your capacity as a detective did you investigate the premises (under discussion with the last witness)?"

Answer. "Yes, sir."

Question. "Will you tell us the results of your investigations and * * * the condition of the inside of the apartment?"

Answer. "It was in an extremely overcrowded, filthy condition. The kitchen—completely overcrowded. There was a gas burner that supplied the heat. The walls were in a state of disrepair. There was no covering on the floor. It appeared it hadn't been painted in many, many years. The one bedroom was cluttered up with furniture so that there was only about a 3-foot space running down the center of the room."

Question. "In your opinion, Detective, is this apartment fit for human habitation?"

Answer. "Definitely not."⁷⁹

Another landlord who claimed to be the owner of a realty corporation in Mercer County admitted to the ownership of 18 or more different properties which with few exceptions were rented exclusively to ADC clients. One frame duplex building located in a slum area contained seven families who paid the following rents:

Two rooms and bath—\$80 month.

Two room and bath—\$70 month (kitchen shared with another tenant).

Four rooms and bath—\$110 month (kitchen shared with another tenant).

Two rooms and bath—\$110 month.

Two rooms and bath—\$60 month.

Two rooms—\$60 month (bath and kitchen shared with another tenant).

One room—\$15 week (bath and kitchen shared with another tenant).

All of these apartments are occupied by ADC families. The cost of this building was approximately \$20,000. The landlord pays annual taxes of almost \$300. His gross income here is \$6,600 annually, and after all expenses, he admits to a net return of approximately \$4,560; a net return of approximately 20 percent on his investment. In 4½ years, this landlord received enough net

income to completely amortize the entire cost of his original investment of \$20,000. When questioned about these rentals, he gave the following testimony:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Hasn't anybody from the Welfare Department ever suggested to you that these rentals are too high and that they should be reduced?"

Answer. "Upon trying to rent the apartments, yes, they have."

Question. "But you have not made any reductions?"

Answer. "No, I don't think I have."

Question. "Of course, the tenants are not interested because they are not paying the rent anyway; isn't that so?"

Answer. "Right."

Question. "You haven't had too much controversy with the Welfare Department about how much these rentals should be, have you?"

Answer. "No."

Question. "Now, in fixing these rentals, did you take into account the fact that due to this grade condition (below ground) some of these properties are flooded during rainy periods, and also did you take into account the fact that the heating equipment was antiquated and the baths and kitchens were shared * * * Was that all taken into account in fixing these rentals?"

Answer. "In one instance, yes."

Question. "And even in view of all these facts, it is your opinion that these are fair rental prices for these properties?"

Answer. "According to my investment, yes, I feel that way."⁸⁰

In order to ascertain the condition of these properties, a staff investigator inspected the premises, and his testimony is sufficiently descriptive in this regard:

BY MR. RICHMAN

Question. "Can you describe to me the nature and condition of these properties and tell me when you were there?"

Answer. "I was there last year during the summer and the condition of the properties was very dirty. They were stinking. In one of the downstairs apartments especially it was so bad that every time you tried to talk the flies would fly all around your mouth, very bad."

Question. "What was the condition of the paint and the upkeep of the properties?"

Answer. "Dirty."

Question. "Did it look to you like these properties have been painted once a year?"

Answer. "No, sir."

Question. "What was the condition of the screens, if any?"

Answer. "There were none."

Question. "There were none?"

Question. "What was the condition of the bathrooms?"

Answer. "Very dirty."

Question. "What kind of fixtures, modern, old?"

Answer. "No, they were old fixtures."

Question. "How about the kitchens?"

Answer. "The kitchens were running true to form with the rest of the apartments."

Question. "How about the equipment in the kitchens, was it old or new?"

Answer. "Well, the people more or less had to share what was in the apartments with each other and what they had wasn't much for what they were paying."

Question. "Did you have any occasion to observe any flooding or any water in any of these apartments?"

Answer. "There was no flooding when we were there. I talked to the clients who were living at the places and they complained of it and in one downstairs apartment I was advised that about a week before I got there,

somebody from the Board of Health had come there and advised them to take the wiring from along the floor board and put it up along the ceiling on account of shocks going across the floor."⁸¹

Although rents for these properties are often exorbitant, and the property is run down and deteriorated, the entire blame cannot be placed on the landlords alone. Frequently ADC tenants fail to adhere to even minimal housekeeping standards of sanitation and cleanliness. They take little interest in their surroundings.⁸² The fact that rents are paid by ADC does not provide sufficient incentive to conserve and maintain the property with even minimal housekeeping standards. Families become destructive. They abuse the property, necessitating constant repairs and costly maintenance. Yet no supervision or control is exercised by welfare officials to minimize these conditions, nor to negotiate for more reasonable and equitable rent payments. The testimony of Mr. Sidney Adelman, Director of Municipal Welfare in Paterson, N.J., reflects these conditions:

BY SENATOR GROSSI

Question. "So the only variable thing is the rent?"

Answer. "Yes. The rent is variable because in New Jersey—to me, it's an awful hard thing to understand, how a tenant can go out and obligate a welfare department, without the consent of the welfare department, without them even knowing about it, to pay any rental that they see fit."

Question. "In other words, a prospective relief client—if they come in and tell you that their rent is \$125 a month, even if that were a hovel, you would pay it?"

Answer. "You have to pay it under the present rules and regulations, but in Pennsylvania they have a schedule and they budget rent the same as they do food. They put it down. I have interrogated the Pennsylvania Department, and I have here their printed manual. Here it is. In Pennsylvania they have a maximum rent of about \$57 a month for five or more people, and I maintain that if we budget our rent in New Jersey, the same as they do in Pennsylvania and many other States, these landlords that rent the rat holes will take the \$57 if they know they can't get any more."

Question. "In your opinion, much of the rent you are paying on the basis of \$25, \$30, or \$35 a week is exorbitant and unwarranted?"

Answer. "It is way out of line. When I was State chairman of the board of control in this city in 1955 and 1956 these places were getting \$18 and \$20 a month."

Question. "For the same places today you are paying as much as \$25 a week or \$100 a month."

Answer. "It's more than \$100. It's four weeks and a third. That's \$108 a month, without utilities. These are cold water flats and they are in the most dilapidated condition and they'd be glad to take \$57 a month."

Question. "Some of these families that are on relief, do any of them receive household aid? By that I mean, does the relief department send somebody there to take care of the house, clean the house, etc."

Answer. "No, the relief department doesn't do that. There is a monthly visit. The statute provides that there shall be one visit a month in the home and the investigators have been instructed, if they see the place in filthy and unkept, to talk to them and persuade them in a kindly way to see that the place is kept clean for the benefit of their children and themselves, and in some instances there is some improvement."⁸³

⁸¹ Ibid.⁸² See plates III and IV.⁸³ Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.⁷⁷ See plate no. I.⁷⁸ See plate No. II.⁷⁹ Second public hearing (Jan. 5, 1961), Paterson, N.J.⁸⁰ Fourth Public Hearing (Feb. 2, 1962), Trenton, N.J.

Presently there is no statutory limit on rents applicable to people on relief, nor are there any regulations pertaining to, or controlling rental payments in New Jersey. Also a review of current law in our State does not indicate that any implied power exists on the part of the commissioner to promulgate rules or regulations in this respect, and county welfare directors are completely devoid of any powers sufficient to exert control and regulation over landlords and their ADC tenants. The need for a clearly expressed public policy in this area is apparent. Statutory limits similar to those in effect in other States for rental of housing facilities should be enacted. This committee can see no reason why recipients of public assistance should be given carte blanche freedom to spend public funds without restraint.

In many cases it may be more feasible to purchase facilities for ADC clients. Where an equitable ownership already exists in property when a client becomes eligible, mortgage payments are usually continued and the committee feels this practice should be continued. However, statutory lien provisions must be provided to safeguard the repayment of ADC grants whenever the client is able to do so in the future, or in the event the property is sold.

Each county welfare director should be empowered by law to utilize liens on both real and personal property on all cases where grants are made under any program of relief in New Jersey. Also, the usual means of enforcing and collecting any moneys due, from agreements or otherwise, should be made available including wage attachments and garnishments.

In addition to poor housing conditions and high rents, many ADC families are victimized by unscrupulous purveyors who offer goods and merchandise, not without awareness that these people are on relief, but in spite of it, offering an almost endless and unlimited credit on "easy" weekly or monthly terms. Without exception, every case investigated by this committee owned relatively new, and often expensive, television sets, and other appliances. Many had private telephone lines, often the latest model princess telephone in colors, while others, in addition to their private telephones, had extension phones, all totally unnecessary to their maintenance and the care of their children.

The incongruity of such apparent luxury in the midst of living conditions which can at best be described as bordering on poverty is difficult to explain and leads the committee to believe that more can be demanded by way of money management and prudence than has been evidenced by the facts uncovered by this committee.

FRAUDS

Fraud is defined as trickery and deceit characterized by the cheat and imposter. Legally, it is an intentional perversion of the truth achieved by deception, guile, subtlety, craftiness, and shams obtaining from another that which rightfully belongs to another. The incidence of fraud in ADC, while not easily ascertainable, is of sufficient proportion that it cannot go unnoticed.

Of greatest frequency are mothers cohabiting with men, sometimes their legal husbands, more often itinerant paramours. If cash income is received from these male members of the household, and not reported to the welfare authorities, it is a clear case of fraud. However, unless ADC benefits are received because a husband is unable to work or other special reason, under the conditions of ADC, a man should not be part of the household. This is another form of fraud, and it must be questioned that if the man is not contributing to the support of the family, is ADC contributing to the support of the man?

Other cases of frauds involve mothers working while the children are cared for by babysitters or other women in the neighborhood; mothers collecting income while on ADC from unemployment compensation or other insurance benefits not known to the caseworker; and still others receiving income from their allegedly deserting husbands whose whereabouts are supposedly unknown. Some mothers have been found to be known prostitutes with police records dating back several years, yet they manage to retain custody of their illegitimate children and remain eligible for ADC payments. But, by far, the two greatest abuses center on unlawful cohabitation of mothers on ADC with boyfriends or paramours, and intentional failure to report earned income from working while supposedly at home caring for their children.

Large urban areas account for a greater frequency of fraud cases than usually found in more rural areas, but this is easily understood when we consider that most ADC recipients are clustered in the larger industrial towns and municipalities.

Many cases of fraud were practiced openly and flagrantly. This committee believes that the high incidence of fraud among ADC cases can be effectively curtailed, and in most cases eliminated; but this responsibility cannot be left to the caseworker alone and combined with his or her many other basic responsibilities. The practice of fraud is a criminal act, necessitating police intervention, investigation and eventual prosecution. In this regard, the ADC program has been completely devoid of police investigatory procedures. Decisions as to whether such clients should be prosecuted are often left to the discretion of the county welfare director, who may or may not report the clients to the county prosecutor for investigation and court litigation. It is clear that some system must be developed whereby separate investigations can be conducted independent and apart from the usual routine work of the social caseworker and where suspected cases of fraud can be uncovered and properly reported for legal disposition. Statutory provisions must be enacted to provide a clear legislative mandate to all State agencies servicing ADC and other relief clients for an exchange of information and review of all files pertaining to clients under investigation. This will facilitate discovery and evaluation of all known facts regarding all ADC and other families and individuals receiving relief, whether such relief is from the State or county.

Consider the following case uncovered by this committee which is typical of the many conditions under which fraud is practiced, sometimes openly, and other times with cunning and deceit.

This man was arrested by police for causing a disturbance in the home of a relief client who later turned out to be his wife. When arrested he gave a sworn statement to the police as follows:

"I am willing to take care of my wife. I come over and visit her every Friday, and I give her \$25 to \$35 every week. Sometimes Fridays she comes to see me (at my home) for the money. In fact she is supposed to come see me tonight, but instead I saw her last night, February 1, 1962, and at her house I found a man with some wine bottles and a fight started and the man * * * got out. I heard that this man is my wife's boy friend. I am willing to take my children and wife to Ocean City to support them. I make \$1.75 an hour and my job is year round. I told my wife this and she stated that she would think about it. She told me the reason she didn't want to come was because she was getting more from State aid. We have been in Atlantic City for 4 years. Five children were born in Florence, S.C., and three children were born here."

This man's wife and eight children have been receiving \$350 a month in addition to \$35 a week allegedly contributed by the husband. The county welfare board had no knowledge of the \$35 per week contribution, and when confronted with this information, the client denied ever receiving it. The husband had two eyewitnesses to confirm his statement, and the fact that she had been seen in his company in Ocean City. When this client was asked by the committee if she had ever seen her husband, she denied it, saying that she would not be allowed to collect her welfare check if she had seen him. At that time she also denied being pregnant with another child. However, in December of 1962, another investigation of this client revealed she had given birth to another child fathered by her boyfriend from Philadelphia. Her grant had been increased to \$371 per month.

Mothers on ADC have a duty and obligation to care for their children as the sole purpose of ADC grants is to enable the mother to provide exclusively for the care and custody of her children. In fact, payment made to these mothers for the care of their children creates a fiduciary relationship in which the mother acts not only as custodian of the children, but also as a custodian of public funds. Where a pregnancy occurs, it must be assumed that only one of two things could have happened—the mother either abandoned the home and children to cohabit with a man outside the home, or she invited the man to cohabit with her in her home and the home of the children.

Every witness interviewed by this committee had clear and certain knowledge that resumption of family life with her husband or spouse would result in termination of their monthly checks. Without exception witnesses testified that they would report their husbands to the welfare board if they tried to return to their family, and it was clear that their sole reason for so testifying was their fear of losing their ADC grant.

However, they seemed to believe that cohabitation with others even though resulting in the birth of a child was within the rules of the game. Again and again witnesses testified openly and freely of their affairs and their paramours without apparent fear that their illicit relationships would jeopardize their ADC benefits. Apparently these women believe that as long as a man does not remain in the house on a permanent basis as a member of the household, his transitory presence is permitted. The results of this fraud are reflected in the following illegitimacy schedule which indicates the status of the mother when the child was born and whether such child was legitimate or illegitimate.

Number of children by legitimacy status¹ and by ADC status of mother when child was born

	Total children	ADC status of mother when child was born		
		Mothers receiving ADC	Mothers not receiving ADC	Unknown
Total.....	52,507	5,544	40,461	502
Legitimate.....	33,216	2,258	30,556	402
Illegitimate.....	19,116	3,261	15,755	100
Unknown.....	175	25	150

¹ 1961 Biennial Statistical Report, revised June 1962.

Even the above figures may be misleading as many children, though classified as "illegitimate" were probably conceived illegitimately, their conception having taken place after the legal husband had deserted the family, but these children are given a presumption of legitimacy.

Construing these figures in the most favorable light, more mothers while receiving ADC gave birth to illegitimate children than mothers who gave birth to legitimate children.

There is sufficient indicia here alone to indicate 3,261 incidents of illegal cohabitation with intent to deceive and defraud.

In the case files of another client there appeared a letter written by the mother to the children's grandmother describing her trip to Georgia in September 1961. Her testimony is a sordid tale of gambling, floating card games, drinking, and prostitution. The letter tells of her travels through the South, and particularly through Georgia, and how much money she has made. She also states that she will return home prior to the time her ADC check is mailed, but that she wants to return to the South as soon as possible to make more money. This client had been arrested for shoplifting on several occasions and convicted, paying fines of \$25 to \$100. There is some evidence that this client is also a user of narcotics. Although this woman has been consistently on relief on ADC since the birth of her four illegitimate children, she has never reported any earned income to the welfare board. Nor has she ever reported that she constantly consorts with various other men who assist her in the support of her children.

Typical of the more flagrant cases of fraud, but by no means an isolated case, was that of the woman with four illegitimate children by four different putative fathers who received a grant of \$221 a month while supposedly at home caring for her illegitimate children. Her testimony admits not only the receipt of ADC relief, but the fact that she was working concurrently while receiving these relief payments, and when not working also collected unemployment compensation. She has a past police record for shoplifting, and had been confined in the New Jersey State Home for Girls.

The cases of fraud enumerated in this report are typical of many cases found throughout the State during the committee's investigations. The incidence of fraud has been found to be fairly substantial, but varies in both kind and degree. It cannot be expected that some degree of fraud will not always exist in a public program involving the expenditures of many millions of dollars each year, but there has been a breakdown in investigative procedures, as well as followups on prosecutions to the extent that in many cases fraud has been practiced openly and flagrantly. Oftentimes when fraud is uncovered or suspected, welfare officials show a tendency to prefer working with the mothers in the hope that they will change their habits rather than refer such matters to the prosecutor's office for action. As a result, fraudulent practices have persisted, where more coercive action may have curtailed them. The committee recommends a greater use of law-enforcement procedures by social workers and welfare officials when fraud is suspected or uncovered.

Another factor bearing heavily on fraud is the nearly complete absence of any requirement for field surveillance of recipients to ascertain their continued eligibility for ADC. Since 1941, the Federal agency (HEW) which supervises the program has only required States and localities to carry out its own approved administrative review procedure amounting to no more than an office paper check on eligibility.

This was dramatically pointed out by recent investigations conducted by Senator ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia in the District of Columbia which uncovered an incidence of fraud making ineligible for ADC payments approximately 60 percent of all recipients of ADC in the District. In later hearings, Bernard W. Scholz, Chief of the District Public Assistance Division admitted that the system of checking on eligibility

needs to be revised drastically, and that the findings "have amply demonstrated that the various review procedures both on our level and on the Federal level which rely on the case record are inadequate * * * You cannot determine from the desk what the actual situation is * * * we will need a field investigation to back up what we find in the record."⁵⁵

Of particular significance to New Jersey is the fact that between December of 1956 and December of 1961, the total number of ADC recipients on a national basis increased by approximately 47 percent, while in New Jersey this increase amounted to 214 percent; the highest increase in ADC recorded for any State in the Union, followed by the District of Columbia with 170 percent increase. The following chart indicates percentage increase or decrease during this period.

PERCENTAGE INCREASE (OR DECREASE) IN THE NUMBER GETTING AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN—DECEMBER 1956 AND DECEMBER 1961⁵⁶

State:	Percent change
Alabama	10
Alaska	-8
Arizona	89
Arkansas	-11
California	81
Colorado	43
Connecticut	47
Delaware	47
District of Columbia	170
Florida	19
Georgia	17
Hawaii	-16
Idaho	47
Illinois	95
Indiana	44
Iowa	43
Kansas	47
Kentucky	15
Louisiana	16
Maine	37
Maryland	70
Massachusetts	43
Michigan	64
Minnesota	40
Mississippi	75
Missouri	43
Montana	1
Nebraska	22
Nevada	145
New Hampshire	26
New Jersey	214
New Mexico	26
New York	43
North Carolina	47
North Dakota	16
Ohio	97
Oklahoma	31
Oregon	126
Pennsylvania	93
Rhode Island	42
South Carolina	17
South Dakota	14
Tennessee	23
Texas	-13
Utah	36
Vermont	32
Virginia	27
Washington	8
West Virginia	16
Wisconsin	40
Wyoming	30
United States	47

CASEWORKERS

More than any other individual involved in the administration of our ADC program,

⁵⁵ U.S. Senate budget hearings, Aug. 8, 1952.
⁵⁶ Computations based on data in Social Security Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1956, table 38, p. 68, and the same, April 1962, table 24, p. 42.

NOTE.—Calculations excluded data on the temporary program of ADC for unemployed parents.

the caseworker represents the pivotal point whereby success and failure may be accurately measured.

The Federal Government recommends that caseworkers be assigned to no more than 60 family cases. This estimate is based on maximum efficiency of the caseworker's ability to deal effectively with the personal problems of families with children deprived of parental support.

To assist such families and promote their daily routines into constructive and socially acceptable patterns, the caseworker must deal with a host of varied problems which may include housing, education, health needs, sanitation, child delinquency, abnormal child behavioral patterns, and illiteracy. They must simultaneously contend with the immoral attitude of mothers; their illicit relations with putative fathers who exist at best as shadowy figures hovering somewhere near the family circle; and the birth of illegitimate children giving rise to a whole set of new and often antagonistic emotional problems causing upset to an already unstable family relationship in groups where the word "family" retains only vestigial residuary meaning.

In addition, she is called upon to ferret out the frauds and the cheats whose cunning and craftiness have qualified them for ADC benefits rather than a measure of need for the protection of abandoned children.

She is expected to do all this between the hours of 8 to 4:30 from Monday through Friday, week in and week out.

Successes are seldom acclaimed. Failures receive publicity. In spite of all this we manage to retain a group of dedicated and loyal people who often receive less in pay than some of their clients receive from their monthly ADC relief grants.

The story of good casework needs to be told for the elementary facts are that we in New Jersey have accorded the caseworker neither the respect they rightfully earn, nor the monetary incentives for which they are qualified. It is not surprising therefore to find that public welfare has become the training ground for young college graduates who soon disappear into the ranks of private welfare agencies where pay is much higher and the rewards of working with more promising families both fruitful and satisfying.

There need be established statewide a minimum beginning salary with regular increments and promotions for all social caseworkers employed in public welfare.

Caseloads per worker must be decreased more in line with the Federal recommendation of 60 per worker.

Leadership must be exerted to effect an affirmative and positive program which has reasonable means of reaching and retaining qualified caseworkers by providing attractive salaries with workable caseloads and such leadership can best be exemplified by our legislature itself, providing the means and wherewithal to achieve these desired objectives.

The most regrettable experience with which this committee was confronted was a petition signed by every caseworker in one of our major counties outlining a whole list of complaints from low salaries to other inadequacies of major import. Investigation of these complaints corroborated their truth. An example of such conditions is illustrated by salaries and caseloads of workers employed in Atlantic County.

ATLANTIC COUNTY

Temporary caseworkers

Services to Apr. 1, 1962:	Salary
2 years, 2 months	\$3,120
2 years	3,120
11 years, 4 months	3,420
2 years, 3 months	3,120
2 years, 3 months	3,120
2 years	3,120
2 years, 3 months	3,120
2 years, 3 months	3,120

Permanent caseworkers

11 months.....	\$3,120
4 years, 11 months.....	3,240
5 months.....	3,120
4 years, 9 months.....	3,240
1 month.....	3,120
3 years, 3 months.....	3,240
28 years, 9 months.....	4,080
21 years.....	3,540
17 years, 3 months.....	3,420
7 years, 7 months.....	3,420
5 years.....	3,120

Special worker on property and resources supervisors

2 years, 3 months.....	\$3,840
19 years, 3 months.....	4,200
15 years, 9 months.....	4,080
3 years, 7 months.....	4,080

Just as surprising is the fact that rural counties having less relief caseloads than usually found in the urban industrial counties usually pay more than the urban county where need is greatest.

What must be realized by the public, our news media, and our legislators at both State and county levels and all other responsible citizens who are concerned with rising relief costs is that good casework, at manageable levels is not a cost expenditure, but an investment, which, properly applied, will result in the savings of thousands of dollars, not to mention the savings which accrue from the reconstruction and salvaging of whole families often comprising the lives of many individuals.

A recent survey of county facilities and social casework programs reveals no positive efforts are in effect to accomplish family stability and familial rehabilitation. To date we have merely supplied money grants to families afflicted by breakdowns substituting for assistance a form of paternalism which in the absence of adequate supervision, has often aided and encouraged the very evils we hope to obviate through ADC.

Much is needed by way of rehabilitation, more intensive casework, education, training, and the development of individual and family traits leading toward self-dependency and self-pride, which is altogether lacking in today's administration of ADC in New Jersey.

The committee believes that a balanced program, operating with sufficient legal and social deterrents commingled with policies of planned rehabilitation and guidance, utilizing all community resources, can achieve that end which we all seek through the administration of public relief in New Jersey, namely; that no person truly in need must suffer from want.

RECOMMENDATIONS

A reading of the foregoing report will indicate that suggestions for change and improvement are self-evident, and it is not the intention of the committee to reiterate at this point those suggestions.

A careful consideration of the evidence produced before it, both verbal and documentary, and consideration of the existing law, leads the committee to recommend the following legislative enactments:

1. That the residency requirements abolished by the act transferring the ADC program to the counties in 1959 be reenacted so as to provide a minimum period of 1 year residency for ADC and all other programs of relief in New Jersey. Temporary relief should be available immediately through the general assistance programs, which should be limited to 30-day periods which may be renewed at the discretion of county and municipal welfare directors.

Current settlement and residency requirements are outmoded and consist of a patchwork of public laws which are conflicting and ambiguous. The committee recommends that title 44 covering poor relief laws and

other statutes affecting residency and settlement requirements be completely revised by the Law Revision Committee so that some uniformity and clarity can be accomplished in this area.

2. Statutory maximum should be enacted for all recipients of ADC and those maximums should apply regardless of the size of the family involved. The committee is of the opinion that the sum of \$300 per month is an adequate and proper maximum.

3. County welfare directors should be required and empowered to attach all real property of each recipient and his or her legally responsible relatives, whenever the total amount paid to any recipient exceeds \$500.

4. County welfare directors should be required and empowered to attach all personal property of each recipient and his or her legally responsible relatives, whenever the total amount paid to any recipient exceeds \$500, except where such attachment would affect and diminish the ability of the person affected to earn his or her livelihood, or would otherwise result in undue hardship.

5. Voluntary agreements for support should be given the effect of law or be eliminated altogether in favor of consent orders signed by a judge of a court of competent jurisdiction.

6. A referee should be appointed by the assignment judge in each county to examine and reexamine all cases of support orders and support agreements. An investigator should be assigned to assist the referee for purposes of making investigations and preparing necessary reports on the basis of such investigations as directed by the referee.

7. A separate staff should be established in each prosecutor's office whose principal purpose would be locating deserting fathers and putative fathers; the pressing of complaints whenever appropriate and the collection of all delinquent accounts resulting from breach of support orders and agreements.

8. Each recipient should be required to furnish, at the commencement of payment, and at each 6-month interval thereafter, a statement setting forth all income, earned or received, and the source thereof. The failure to furnish such a statement, or the falsification of any material fact contained therein, either by commission or omission, should be declared to be a misdemeanor.

9. Whenever, in the judgment of county welfare directors, a recipient of relief has:

(a) So conducted herself as to demonstrate an inability to budget and manage her affairs so as to regularly feed and properly care for her child or children; or

(b) On one or more occasions absented herself from her child or children for periods of 12 hours or more without providing for their adequate care or supervision; or

(c) Given birth to an illegitimate child; or

(d) Unreasonably obligated herself by pledging her credit; or

(e) Habitually frequenting establishments where alcoholic beverages are sold, or

(f) Habitually indulge in the use of alcoholic beverages or narcotics, or

(g) Conducted herself in a dissolute and immoral manner, no sums in excess of \$25 per month shall be paid to such recipient.

In lieu of such suspended payments, the county welfare director shall issue to such recipient vouchers of an equal or lesser dollar value as he may determine in such denominations as he may deem advisable, which may be used for the purpose of food, medicine, clothing and fuel for home heating, lighting and cooking, and shall be redeemed in cash by the county welfare director upon presentation to him by any bona fide merchant who regularly supplies food, medicine, clothing, or such fuel. Such

vouchers shall not be valid for purchase of alcoholic beverages, electrical appliances, radio or television sets, automobiles or automotive parts or equipment, or any other item which cannot be clearly classified as food, medicine, clothing, or fuel for home heating, lighting, and cooking.

The committee recognizes that such individuals would be disqualified for participation in the Federal categorical assistance program of aid-to-dependent children with subsequent loss of funds through Federal participation. However, we believe that some reasonable degree of control must be maintained on the State and county level for the supervision of those individuals who flagrantly violate their legal and moral responsibilities in the care of their children. Such reclassification should not be construed to mean that these individuals may not qualify for future benefits under the ADC program when there is shown a reasonable capability and willingness to comply with the minimum requirements of the ADC program.

10. Whenever the atmosphere of a recipient's home or place of residence has deteriorated morally as evidenced by the birth of illegitimate children to either the recipient or any member of her household, then the child or children of such recipient should, in the discretion of the county welfare director, be forthwith removed from her care and all payments terminated.

Permissive legislation should be enacted vesting authority to the county welfare directors to locate, supervise, and maintain concurrently and in conjunction with the State board of child welfare foster home facilities for the placement of such child or children who may be removed from the care of ADC recipients as provided herein.

11. Whenever a landlord enters into any leasing arrangement with a recipient of aid, knowing such person to be in receipt of such aid, he shall by entering into such arrangement, be deemed to have consented to and, therefore, agreed to abide by the following determinations to be made by the county welfare director:

(a) The determination of a fair rental value;

(b) The necessity for and the accomplishment of such repairs as the director may require so as to render the premises sanitary, safe, and habitable.

Any landlord who, under the circumstances described above, charges a recipient or attempts to obtain from any recipient of aid, rental in excess of that determined by the county welfare director, will be guilty of a misdemeanor.

If the landlord is aggrieved by any determination of the director, he shall be entitled to appeal such determination to a court of competent jurisdiction.

12. When the father of an illegitimate child has been determined by the order or judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, such child shall be treated the same as though he were the legitimate child of such father so that such child and his issue may inherit and take from such father, and such father from the child and his issue. This will satisfy requirements of Federal law and qualify such children for Social Security benefits based on the father's earnings providing a new resource available for the child's support.

13. In the administration of public assistance numerous persons are encountered who, although in need and otherwise eligible, are subject to a mental, physical or emotional handicap which makes them incapable of receiving and utilizing public assistance payments for their best interests. The only way these people can be helped is to designate a competent person to receive and expend the assistance payments on their behalf. In such cases no Federal matching

funds can be received unless the assistance payments on behalf of the needy individual are made to a person who has been appointed by judicial order under existing statutes.

At the present time the only available procedures for such judicial appointment are provided by the general guardianship statutes. When the function of the designee is to handle public assistance payments, the appointment of a general guardian involves an unduly complex and costly process. It is recommended that where, upon complaint properly made to a court of competent jurisdiction, a recipient of aid is found to be functionally incompetent to receive such aid, such court should be permitted to designate a "representative payee" who should be personally liable for the proper expenditure of all payments of aid on behalf of such recipient. The purpose of this recommendation is to provide summary and simplified judicial proceedings under which a representative payee could be appointed solely for the purpose of receiving and administering public assistance payments on behalf of an individual requiring this protection.

The foregoing constitutes the legislative recommendations of the committee.

In order that the administration of the ADC program may be properly conducted, it is essential that the heavy caseload borne by the caseworkers should be substantially reduced to a maximum average of approximately 60. The salaries of caseworkers are low and if maximum efficiency is to be obtained and the program properly administered and policed, those salaries must be substantially increased.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN J. KOLE, JUDGE, BERGEN COUNTY JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT

I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity to speak on this most important and vexing social problem.

At the outset, I should like to point out the need for perspective in this field, as in any area of social endeavor. True, there are abuses of the ADC welfare program—some of them very serious. But, unfortunately, there always appears to be people who are chiselers, who take unfair advantage of any government or social program, and who thereby in effect subvert the purpose of the program.

Assistance to the needy, as a public measure, has a very long history. I read recently that the progenitors of our public assistance programs may be found in the Poor Laws enacted in the Elizabethan era of over 3½ centuries ago, and that within 100 years after their inception in England, they were already the subject of sweeping condemnation. Thus, one writer quotes from a source published in 1686 which stated as to their Poor Laws:

"Not occasioned by any dearth or scarcity of necessity, there being never a greater plenty; nor for want of employment, there being never more, nor thru smallness of wages, that being never so great. But by Idleness, Profuse Expenses, the ill bringing up of children and the younger sort".

And here we are with complaints and evidence of abuses similar in nature to those which were condemned 300 years ago.

As I understand ADC, one of its primary functions is to benefit young children by affording financial aid so that their mothers may remain at home to care for and supervise them. Basically, I believe that this is a sound objective; my experience in the juvenile court has indicated that, often there appears to be a direct relationship between the mother who works while her children are at home and the delinquency of one or more of the children in the family. Lack of maternal care and supervision, lack of a mother figure to talk over school and other problems that are bursting to be told as soon as a child gets home from school—can be tantamount in some cases to the neglect of children that can spell trouble. To the extent,

therefore that ADC serves the function of keeping a mother at home properly to supervise and take care of her children, to that extent it would appear to be a worthwhile program which should be continued—if only as a means of preserving the cohesiveness and unity of the mother and children and as a juvenile delinquency preventive.

But what about the mother of an illegitimate child or illegitimate children who is obtaining ADC. Should she be encouraged by financial aid to stay at home to take care of and supervise her illegitimate child or children? Does the financial assistance she gets actually encourage the begetting of further illegitimate children by her either deliberately or wantonly, knowing the economic wants of the child will be taken care of by governmental relief?

These are very complex questions not subject to an easy answer. It would seem to me that no flat rule can be established which would cover all illegitimate children and their mothers. The problem, it seems to me, must be handled on an individual case-to-case basis under certain guiding general principles.

I can recall cases in my court of mothers of illegitimate children who are doing a fairly decent job in raising them. On the other hand, I can recall situations where the mother was obviously a bad influence for the children and should have been separated from them. I am aware of cases in my court where even in the case of legitimate children, the mother wanted the father breadwinner out of the house because she obtained more by ADC. And I also have had paternity cases before me where it seemed fairly clear that the pattern of illegitimate births established by the woman had at least not been discouraged by the prospect of receiving ADC. I had one case about a year ago where we spent two afternoons in a paternity case involving one mother, two illegitimate children, and three separate putative fathers.

Illegitimate children are, of course, a social and moral problem much broader than the ADC program. However, there is no doubt that illegitimate children do create a substantial financial burden on the program in our county—Bergen County. In Bergen County, illegitimacy ranks second as a cause of dependency under the program, second only to desertion of a parent. Of the 483 families on the rolls in 1961, 193 were dependent because of the desertion of a parent; 162 illegitimate children of 52 unwed mothers received ADC from our county welfare board. This compares with 76 illegitimate children and 35 unwed mothers in 1960. The approximate cost of supporting the 162 illegitimate children and 52 unwed mothers in 1961 was \$12,500 per month.

What can be done to lighten the cost to the program of illegitimacy and to prevent the program from being misused by mothers who continue to have illegitimate births? I wish, as I am sure you all do, I knew the answer. But the best I can do is offer some suggestions that have occurred to me:

1. More extensive and vigorous prosecution of paternity proceedings in both the municipal and county juvenile and domestic relations courts is one way to reduce the public relief rolls. Placing the father under an order of support and compelling him to comply therewith would, of course, remove some illegitimate children from ADC. But paternity is a difficult thing to prove, particularly where the mother is sexually promiscuous. The answer here, it seems to me, is to equip the county welfare boards with an attorney whose function it will be to investigate, properly prepare and vigorously present these cases to the municipal and county courts. We cannot rely solely on the woman's presentation of the case and, of course, the court, in all fairness to the defendant, cannot assume the role of attorney for the woman. Another difficulty in the

paternity suit arises from the lack of means or desire to support on the part of the putative fathers. Some are married and endeavoring to support existing families—an adequate order for the illegitimate child might be enough to throw his family on relief; and many are of the shiftless, irresponsible variety, whose earning capacity is low. The courts can endeavor to compel them by order to assume their responsibility by working two jobs. If they do not, the alternative is a jail term, during which time they obviously cannot support and, in turn, they, as well as the illegitimate child, are being supported by the county.

Despite the difficulties of determining paternity, entering an adequate support order and enforcing the order, I do feel that this is where the courts can assist in reducing the burden of the cost of illegitimacy on the ADC program, provided the appropriate prosecuting tools are made available to the welfare boards. In our county, vigorous enforcement along these lines is attempted by our welfare board, but more legal and investigative assistance is needed.

In our county at present, the situation regarding paternity suits as reflected in the records of our probation office is as follows:

Municipal Division: 60 fathers paying for support of 74 illegitimate children.

Juvenile Division: Three girls with illegitimate children.

Domestic Relations Division: 42 fathers paying for support of 54 illegitimate children.

Criminal Division: One father paying for support of two illegitimate children.

2. Consideration should be given to placing the mother of an illegitimate child who seeks ADC under active supervision of a social caseworker—either a probation officer of the probation office or a similar person employed by the county welfare board. To make this suggestion meaningful would require small caseloads and active case supervision by skilled personnel. Many of the women are inadequate and will need almost day-to-day guidance in being good, moral, and responsible parents; many need instruction and education in the danger of promiscuity and the moral and legal implications of illicit intercourse and having illegitimate children, including knowledge that they may be subject to criminal prosecution and their children may be taken away from them if they continue their immoral course of conduct. Our probation office informs me that in certain instances where they have had a juvenile or other young woman on probation by reason of such illegitimate child being born, she has been actively assisted by such supervision and no additional illegitimate children have been born to her.

3. In our county we have a family counselor attached to the juvenile and domestic relations court. His primary function to date has been to endeavor to keep legitimate families together. His staff is being increased with a view toward assisting families receiving ADC in reestablishing themselves as a family unit with the husband and father working and supporting. He may also be asked—on an experimental basis—to work with unwed mothers on ADC to determine whether such a service can help reduce illegitimacy. The results of this experiment, if undertaken, may prove of some value to the committee.

4. Where there is more than one illegitimate child, the mother who gets ADC relief might well be brought to the juvenile and domestic relations or municipal court, either in a proceeding for that purpose instituted by the Welfare Board, or in connection with a paternity proceeding, and placed on probation with the Probation Office. In either event, it would appear that legislation would have to be adopted authorizing placing the woman on probation and authorizing her commitment for the sole purpose of rehabilitation to an appropriate institution in the event of violation of probation. The statute,

it is suggested, should not be punitive in nature, should only cover the woman who has more than one child out of wedlock who requires ADC assistance for support, and who has clearly demonstrated that counseling and supervision in the community have failed as to her.

Custody proceedings might also be instituted in serious cases in the juvenile and domestic relations court under R.S. 9:2-9 to take custody away from such a mother on the ground that her immoral behavior is harmful to the children's welfare.

Of course, either of the foregoing suggestions would create the problem of where to place the children, and they will undoubtedly have to be supported—at least for a while—at public expense. However, from the standpoint of their future welfare, it would seem that they would be better off away from the mother who has been found to be a serious violator.

5. Consideration might also be given to legislation permitting the counties to establish day care centers so that able-bodied mothers of illegitimate children getting ADC relief could work during the day and have their children properly cared for while they work. This would permit the mother to

assume part of the financial responsibility of raising the child and help to keep her out of further trouble. Part of the cost of day care might be paid by the mother from her earnings. A warning is in order here, however. There may be cases where it is better for the children—particularly where the mother is basically a good mother—for the mother not to work. So that requiring all such mothers to work may not be desirable. A case-to-case approach in this connection I believe would be the wisest course.

The problem I have been discussing is, as I have indicated, not an easy one of solution. I have tried to point to some possible approaches to minimize the harmful impact of illegitimacy on the ADC program and the possible adverse effect of the ADC program in promoting an increase in illegitimacy. The answer is not to cut off aid to illegitimate children. They need assistance and protection certainly to the same extent as legitimate children. In many respects they need greater and more active protection from society for a condition not of their own making. The latter consideration—their welfare—should be the prime consideration in adopting any plan designed to modify the existing ADC program.

been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BAYH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. CHURCH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. INOUE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. SYMINGTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were privileged to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent due to illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], and the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Il-

CONDENSED SCHEDULES OF ALLOWANCES

Combined schedules XI-A and XI-B

TOTAL WEEKLY ALLOWANCES FOR PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD NEEDS

	Family size					
	1	2	3	4	5 to 6	7 and over
Birth to 3 years.....		\$8.01	\$7.29	\$6.55	\$6.37	\$6.18
Child 4 to 9 years.....		9.81	8.98	8.12	7.94	7.75
Child 10 to 12 years.....		12.07	11.08	10.04	9.85	9.67
Girl 13 to 18 years.....		13.11	12.07	11.01	10.82	10.64
Boy 13 to 18 years.....		14.45	13.27	12.07	11.88	11.70
Adult 18 or over.....	\$15.55	12.99	12.05	11.10	10.92	10.73

NOTE.—Add for employed adult \$7.15 weekly for personal expenses of employment.

Schedule IX

TOTAL WEEKLY ALLOWANCES FOR HOUSEHOLD NEEDS ITEMS

	Family size					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Cooking.....	\$0.52	\$0.53	\$0.69	\$0.69	\$0.69	\$0.83
Water heating.....	.50	.51	.83	.83	.83	1.11
Light and electric appliance.....	.69	.69	.90	.90	.90	1.04
Refrigeration.....	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35	.35
Fuel for heat.....	1.38	1.85	2.33	2.77	3.23	3.74
Total for family.....	3.44	3.93	5.10	5.54	6.00	7.07

1. Family size refers to the number of people for whom marketing and food preparation is done in common.
2. For purposes of budgeting, the age of the child means the age at his nearest birthday.
3. The above schedules are to be used in computing the capacity of parents to support their children.

JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT OF ESSEX COUNTY, NEWARK, N.J.

(Date)
Re admission of paternity.
Being duly sworn, I -----
(Putative father)
acknowledge in open court I am the father
of -----
(O/W child or children)
born to -----
(Mother)
born in -----
(Date of birth) (Municipality
(O/W child) and State)
born in -----
born in -----
born in -----
(Defendant's present address)

(Signature)

COURT'S DISPOSITION

(Date)
Appeared before me this date -----
(Putative father)
who admitted in open court he is the father
of the above-named child ----- and
I ordered as follows:
\$----- week direct for support of
child -----
\$----- week pay through probation
for support of child -----
\$----- week for support of child
----- and placed him on proba-
tion for a period of ----- year -----
Remarks: -----

(Judge)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. The yeas and nays have

Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] has been previously announced.

On this vote, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 42, as follows:

[No. 241 Leg.]

YEAS—35

Aiken	Humphrey	Muskie
Beall	Jackson	Nelson
Bible	Javits	Pell
Burdick	Kennedy	Prouty
Cannon	Kuchel	Proxmire
Case	McCarthy	Ribicoff
Clark	McGovern	Scott
Dodd	McIntyre	Smith
Fong	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hart	Moss	

NAYS—42

Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Anderson	Hartke	Mundt
Bartlett	Hayden	Pearson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Boggs	Hill	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Simpson
Carlson	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Talmadge
Curtis	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Ervin	Mechem	Walters
Fulbright	Miller	Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—23

Bayh	Engle	Morse
Brewster	Holland	Neuberger
Church	Inouye	Pastore
Dirksen	Keating	Robertson
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Long, La.	Symington
Edmondson	Magnuson	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McGee	

So Mr. RIBICOFF's amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

THE KERR-MILLS MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, last month the Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly of the Special Senate Committee on Aging issued its third annual report evaluating the performance of the Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged program.

The report of the Health Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, was objectively critical of the manner in which

Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the aged has been operating, and listed seven basic defects of the program.

This report has received widespread and largely favorable attention in the Nation's press—both editorially and in news stories.

This indicates to me that the issue of hospital insurance for the elderly—although it has been on the legislative "back burner" for some time—is still a very potent issue.

I am confident that this 88th Congress—before it concludes its work next year—will approve a program of medical care for the elderly along the lines recommended by President Kennedy.

A necessary preliminary to this action begins today when a committee of the other body begins public hearings on legislative proposals in this area.

In view of this renewed attention to this most important public responsibility, I ask unanimous consent that a selection of editorials commenting on the subcommittee report on the Kerr-Mills program be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Nov. 5, 1963]

SHORTCHANGING THE AGED

Three years after its adoption the Kerr-Mills program of medical assistance for the aged is proving a meager answer to financing care for elderly persons too poor to pay their own hospital and medical bills.

The report of a Senate subcommittee indicates that only 2 percent of the Nation's 18 million aged received aid under the program in any part of the last fiscal year. Even this tiny proportion is an exaggeration, since many thousands were persons who had received care under public relief programs before the Federal system of matching grants for the medically indigent was enacted.

Only 28 States have yet put plans in operation; the duration and types of benefits vary widely; stringent eligibility tests and the humiliating means test discourage participation, and the great bulk of the funds go to the wealthiest States. Administrative costs eat up much of the Federal allocation, partly because of the newness of the program but even more because of the complexity of the rules governing enforcement.

The concept that a combination of Kerr-Mills and private health insurance will give America's older citizens adequate protection against the economic hazards of ill health is plainly an illusion. Until the Kennedy administration makes a real fight for its program of hospital care for the aged under the social security system, tens of thousands of the elderly will lack the safeguards they need and should have. This has become one of the great forgotten issues of 1963. It cannot stay forgotten in 1964.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier Post, Nov. 8, 1963]

KERR-MILLS FAILURE

Its advocates may be right in saying that so far the Kerr-Mills law for medical aid to the aged has not had a fair test. But so far it definitely has not been a success on a national scale.

About half the States, New Jersey included, have put plans into effect to implement the Federal law. (This State's plan was effective July 1.) But a Senate subcommittee now reports that only 2 percent of the 18 million aged citizens in the Nation received any benefit from Kerr-Mills during the last fiscal year. And many of them were simply

persons who were transferred to Kerr-Mills benefits from the relief rolls.

Apparently Kerr-Mills is not even serving as an effective stopgap for elderly persons until enactment of a more comprehensive medicare program. Medicare under the social security system was supposedly one of the prime objectives of the Kennedy administration for 1963, but now has been shunted aside until 1964, at least. Unless the administration puts up more of a fight for it then than it did this year, its 1964 hopes are dim.

[From the Newark (N.J.) News, Oct. 31, 1963]

REISSUED FOR 1964

This month marks the third anniversary of the Kerr-Mills program for medical aid to indigent elderly persons. But the sharply critical report on the program issued by the Democratic majority on the Senate Subcommittee on Aging is hardly fitting in celebrating a birthday.

The Democratic Senators declared the program "degrading" and "ineffective." The report further charged that five of the wealthiest States thus far had received 88 percent of all Federal funds under the program, although they have but 32 percent of the eligible elderly.

Perhaps the attack is premature. After all, the program is only 3 years old and maybe not all the evidence is in. Yet there is justification for some of the criticism.

Participation by the 18 million of the Nation's aged has been limited because of the strict means tests imposed on applicants for help. Some States apparently have taken advantage of the law to shift impoverished aged persons from welfare rolls to the programs. Furthermore, the implication of welfare undoubtedly has prevented many qualifying for aid from seeking it.

The Kerr-Mills program certainly is not nationwide, only 28 States, including New Jersey, participating. Among States not joining, cost has been a decisive factor.

The program definitely is not a substitute for health insurance under social security. A significant point brought out by the report is that only 140,000 are receiving benefits from the program out of the 10 million medically indigent it was designed to protect.

About 8 million other elderly persons who are not eligible because of the means tests are, of course, excluded altogether. In this State, for example, of the estimated 500,000 persons of 65 and over, only 8,000, or about 1.5 percent, are eligible under the Kerr-Mills law.

Weaknesses in the program have been fairly well advertised since its enactment in 1960. Why the subcommittee majority should take the occasion of the third birthday to rehash the old arguments isn't altogether clear. But one thing is certain: the health of the elderly, which started out as a social concern, is now in politics to stay.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Oct. 30, 1963]

CRITICS WITHOUT A PROGRAM

Senator HICKENLOOPER, one of the GOP Senate leaders, has called this "one of the slowest and most ineffective Congresses we have ever had," and blamed the administration for failing to provide strong leadership.

But if there has been a leadership vacuum, why haven't HICKENLOOPER and his GOP colleagues rushed in to fill with programs of their own? For example, there is the problem of medical aid for the elderly. Why didn't they try to do something about it?

Last February the President renewed his request for a hospital insurance program for the elderly to be financed through social security.

But the GOP said "No, give the existing Kerr-Mills measure a chance." This program enacted in 1960 provides Federal

matching funds to States for the care of medically indigent old people.

Now a Senate subcommittee discloses anew that Kerr-Mills isn't working—that after 3 years it is still not a national program, that means tests have severely restricted participation, that administrative costs are too high, and that, generally speaking, the program has proved ineffective.

What is the GOP answer to this indictment? It is not to rush in with a program to meet the needs thus documented. This is a "premature judgment based on inadequate evidence," it laconically comments. And it says no more.

[From the Trainman News, Nov. 4, 1963]

BACK H.R. 3920

The King-Anderson bill (H.R. 3920), which would provide hospital insurance for the Nation's elderly citizens under the social security and railroad retirement systems, must be enacted if the oldtimers are to receive the adequate assistance that is due them.

A poor job of directing medical care aid to the aged folks is being done by the 1960 Kerr-Mills Act, with its program in the various States.

Bolstering previous facts made known to the public since the Kerr-Mills program got under way, the Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly recently released a report hitting the plan as being "ineffective."

Senator PAT McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee, declared that the report confirms his "long-standing belief that only through the universal approach of a social security-financed program can the basic health needs of our senior citizens be effectively met."

Other Democrats on the subcommittee joined McNAMARA in noting that the report, which is an evaluation of medical assistance for the aged—the Kerr-Mills program 1960-63, is proof that the Kerr-Mills plan cannot assure "millions of older people . . . economic access to adequate medical care on a decent, self-respecting basis."

Even by the end of 1964, the report points out, there will be 10 to 15 States without the Kerr-Mills program under way.

The program is now in operation in 28 States and the annual rate of Kerr-Mills MAA expenditures was approximately \$350 million as of August of this year.

Despite the fact that they have only 32 percent of the oldtimers 65 and over, New York, California, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania received 88 percent of the funds up to December 31, 1962.

Said John W. Edelman, acting president of the National Council of Senior Citizens, Inc.: "The Senate unit's report offers abundant evidence that the strained financial resources of many States make the well-intentioned aims of Kerr-Mills MAA law impossible of realization as a national program. While Kerr-Mills has been proving its inadequacy for 3 years, Congress has failed to enact the vitally necessary program to provide hospital insurance for older Americans through the time-tested social security system."

The House Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to begin hearings November 18 on the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 3920), backed by the Kennedy administration and organized labor, and other related matters. They will continue for 9 days.

Letters and wires to our congressmen at this time, urging enactment of H.R. 3920, could play an important part in getting the measure on the way to enactment.

The effort is well worth a try.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Nov. 4, 1963]

KERR-MILLS AFTER 3 YEARS MOCKS NEEDS OF THE AGED

The Kerr-Mills program, which supposedly would enable elderly people of limited means

to meet their medical expenses in the self-respecting American way, was 3 years old in October. Senator PAT McNAMARA's subcommittee on the health of the elderly has issued an anniversary report analyzing the achievements of the program up through last August.

The figures are illuminating. They will confirm the fears of those who never could generate much faith in the Kerr-Mills approach and arouse the protests of those who, like Senator GOLDWATER and two other dissenting Republicans on the subcommittee, feel that the plan hasn't had time to prove itself in 3 years.

The total expenditure of Federal and State money through August of this year was \$580 million. The annual cost is now around \$350 million. But these sums are being spent in only 28 States and four jurisdictions; although all State legislatures have now had an opportunity to consider matching legislation, 22 have either not done so or have not completed their plans.

A MEAGER TOTAL

Furthermore, out of the 7,610,000 elderly people with incomes of \$2,000 or down in this country, a meager 148,000 were receiving benefits in July of this year, a majority of these being from five States: California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania. These States, with only 32 percent of the Nation's elderly, received 88 percent of all Federal funds for medical assistance and New York, with only 10 percent of the aged, collected 42 percent of the money.

This figure of 148,000, moreover, is misleading in its implications. It must be remembered that the primary intent of the Kerr-Mills Act was to establish a new category of public assistance, but one which would not carry to its potential beneficiaries the dreaded stigma of "relief." It offered the States a chance to obtain matching Federal grants in order to help elderly people not on relief to meet pressing medical expenses.

What has actually happened is that many States, unable in the first place to meet the pressing relief needs of their needy, put in token programs or made the financial restrictions so severe that self-respecting elderly people withdrew applications rather than liquidate their small savings or have their relatives pressured for aid. "There are at least 14 States," according to the subcommittee report, "in which the means test for medical assistance would eliminate many of the aged people who have qualified for other relief programs."

THE DIMENSION OF FAILURE

Because of the few people who have applied or who qualify; because, also, of the comparative generosity of Federal Kerr-Mills grants compared to other shared programs, nearly 100,000 of those receiving medical assistance were already being aided by the States under another relief category. The States, in other words, have transferred elderly people with health problems, whom they were already caring for anyway, to this newer program and thereby relieved some of their own financial burdens.

One cannot blame the States for doing so, and they are certainly neither evading nor stretching the law. But the fact remains that a program which the AMA still says is meeting the health needs of the Nation's elderly, which both candidates in Kentucky's Governor election have endorsed in preference to a social security approach to the problem, is reaching almost none of the people it is intended to reach.

One objection to social security medical care (which is favored by the majority of the McNAMARA subcommittee) invariably raised by AMA spokesmen is that it would set up a "bureaucracy," which would enmesh doctor and patient in its toils. Apart from the patent inaccuracy of the charge (the social security plan would not pay doctors

and would apply only to hospital and nursing home care) the Kerr-Mills plan has set up an impressive bureaucracy of its own. Administrative costs nationally run to 6.2 percent and fluctuate widely among the States. Tennessee spends 59 percent of its direct grants on administration. Kentucky spends 29 percent. Four other States spend more than 25 cents of the dollar on administration.

The foregoing summarizes only the major points on which the Kerr-Mills Act has failed to meet the very need it was specifically aimed at. Elderly people in desperate need of medical care have shunned a program which pries into their lives and those of their children, which brings them at last to the very fate they have struggled a lifetime to avert—that of being "dependent." Other aged persons, less fortunate or less strong willed, have simply been shunted from one category to another so that the money may be claimed.

One is compelled to ask: If all States qualified for matching funds; if all of them liberalized income limits and ceased to make mendicants of applicants, how much money in direct taxation would Kerr-Mills be likely to cost and how much would have to be spent on its expanding bureaucracy?

Compared to this, health payments to the elderly, financed through a small increase in social security taxes, would cut overhead to almost nothing, would require no demeaning inquiries and pledges from applicants, and would put no proliferating burden on the general taxpayer. Which plan sounds more like the "American way of life," which more like the ultimate extension of the welfare state?

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 12, 1963]

THIS, TOO, SHALL NOT PASS

(By John Herling)

What's going to happen in 1963 to the administration's legislation on hospital care for the aging? Apparently, nothing.

Two years ago, the late Senator Robert Kerr, Democrat, of Oklahoma, holding the Senate machinery in his sophisticated hands, played brinkmanship with a similar bill and then killed it by pushing it off Capitol Hill. It teetered at the edge by a narrow four-vote margin. For Mr. Kerr and colleagues, the administration's bill had been found guilty by association with the social security system and was marked for death.

At any rate, the latest version of the bill is being slowly trotted out of the stables of the Ways and Means Committee. This once proud legislative steed, still sporting the Kennedy silks, seems to have been relegated to the "not now, Buster" category. If this condition continues without vigorous protest from Democratic leaders, then organized labor and lots of other folks have a major gripe with this administration.

In Philadelphia last week, President Kennedy received additional confirmation of the strong hold this issue retains on voters of all ages. He got his biggest hand there—unexpectedly to those concentrating on Washington's tactical capers—when he banged home the importance of social security-related hospital care: "We intend to see to it that no American is forgotten, ill-treated or cast off . . . in old age."

The explanation being offered for the legislation's poor prospects currently is that WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is against it. What's more, because he had joined forces with Senator Kerr, Mr. MILLS has a vested legislative and prestige interest in the Kerr-Mills Act which was passed as an alternative to the kind of bill proposed by liberal forces.

The most Mr. MILLS consents to do now is to hold hearings for a couple of weeks,

starting next Monday. But he has made it clear that this is as far as he will go, so there is little chance for action by his committee this year. Apparently his labors on the tax-cut bill have tired him out. Or maybe this is all he cares to do about something which goes against the grain.

Meantime, Senator Pat McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Health for the Elderly, has just issued a blasting analysis of the Kerr-Mills program, known as Medical Assistance for the Aged, or MAA. In reply, Republican Senators DIRKSEN, of Illinois; GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and CARLSON, of Kansas, defend MAA, and make the special point that, in addition to MAA, voluntary health insurance has proved an important method of financing the costs of medical care for persons over 65.

In its analysis, Senator McNAMARA's subcommittee spells out the inadequacies of MAA in various States, especially Connecticut. To which the Dirksen-Goldwater group replied triumphantly that such a harsh judgment fails to reckon that "85 percent of that State's 65-plus population has voluntary coverage," and does not qualify for MAA since it requires a "means" test to prove financial distress.

Unfortunately for the Senate minority's argument, evidence of serious financial shortcomings in Connecticut's "voluntary insurance" plan has cropped up in the last few weeks. There the "Connecticut 65" group—a multibillion interagency organization of nearly all insurance companies—had offered comprehensive medical and hospital insurance to State residents over 65, advertising it on a "minimum-cost, nonprofit basis."

In this as in other States, the Nation's leading insurance companies had put on a concerted drive to move into the aging field, as a countermove to the proposed old age medical care legislation. They thus gave the opponents of social security-financed hospital care legislation a plausible, even virtuous, argument. After all, they said, why deprive the old folks of their right to choose their own type of insurance, voluntary and cheap?

Persuasively, the insurance companies offered attractively low rates. In this way they hoped to overcome the arguments to the social security advocates who contend that the burdens of financing medical care ought not to be loaded on people after 65, or on their families which might have to pay the insurance bills.

Now the sad fact is that the period of bargain rates is over. The insurance companies now announce they must raise their charge by 20 percent. The State insurance department will hold hearings on the request. Thus, the old folks now find themselves caught in the middle. Their "voluntary" plan has suddenly turned compulsory, they must pay a higher rate to keep their policies, or the insurance companies will cut back on medical services—or cut out of the picture.

In these significant, related developments, Senator McNAMARA sees new and urgent reasons for finding that the "Kerr-Mills MAA cannot do the job of providing adequate medical care on a decent, self-respecting basis for our senior citizens."

[From the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Post-Gazette, Nov. 11, 1963]

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED HOT AGAIN; HEARINGS SOON

(By George Zielke)

WASHINGTON.—As the 1st session of the 88th Congress wound up its 10th month, lawmakers finally got around to a subject destined to be an issue again in the 1964 elections—medical care for the aged.

The House Ways and Means Committee, where such legislation must originate, announced hearings on the subject to begin November 18.

The announcement from Committee Chairman WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, listed as the first term: "The adequacy of medical programs under existing law (Kerr-Mills Act)."

After that, Mr. MILLS listed "the extent and adequacy of coverage under private or nongovernmental health insurance programs"; President Kennedy's medicare proposal and "proposed alternatives."

The Mills part of the title of the Kerr-Mills Act refers to its coauthor, Chairman MILLS.

The Kerr-Mills Act has been on the books 3 years. It was enacted in the 1960 post-convention session after the Senate rejected the approach of Senator John F. Kennedy—which was, and is, addition of medical care to the social security pension system, with a boost in the contribution rate levied on workers' wages.

Under the Kerr-Mills law, the Federal Government offers grants to the States, under a matching formula, if they arrange programs to cover medical expenses of "aged individuals who are not recipients of old-age assistance (i.e., relief) but whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical expenses."

The dispute over effectiveness of the law reflects the basic differences of opinion.

A Senate Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly, headed by Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, came out 2 weeks ago with a sharp report declaring the program ineffective.

The subcommittee said that in July 1963, "Only 148,000 people received MAA (medical assistance for the aged) assistance—or less than 1 percent of the Nation's older citizens."

The subcommittee report listed seven major defects of the program.

"After 3 years it is still not a national program, and there is no reason to expect that it will become one in the foreseeable future."

"Stringent eligibility tests, lien type recovery provisions and responsible relative provisions have severely limited participation in those jurisdictions."

"Except for those four States having comprehensive programs (Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York and North Dakota) benefits are nominal, nonexistent or inadequate."

"Administrative costs of MAA programs remain too high in most jurisdictions."

"The distribution of Federal matching funds under MAA has been grossly disproportionate, with a few wealthy States, best able to finance their phase of the program, getting a lion's share of the funds. Five States, California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, for example, received 88 percent of all Federal MAA funds distributed from the start of the program through December 31, 1962 (that is, 88 percent of \$189 million), although those five States have only 32 percent of the Nation's elderly people."

"The congressional intent to extend assistance to a new type of medically indigent person through MAA has been frustrated by the practice of several States in transferring 100,000 persons already on other welfare programs * * * to the Kerr-Mills program. The States have done this to take advantage of the higher matching grant provisions of Kerr-Mills, saving millions of dollars in State costs, but diverting money meant for other purposes."

"The welfare aspects of the MAA program, including cumbersome investigations of eligibility, plus the requirement in most States that resources of an older person must be depleted to a point of near-dependency, have further reduced participation."

The subcommittee report carried a dissent by three Republicans, Senators EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois; BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona; and FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

They differed with every conclusion of the majority and said 55 percent of the people past 65 had voluntary health insurance coverage as of the end of 1961 and added: "Nor is there substantiation for the claim, oft repeated that those persons without health insurance are unable to pay for it."

Thus the battle lines are being drawn for a resumption of large-scale debate on this long-debated issue.

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Nov. 1, 1963]

KERR-MILLS BILL FAILS TO MEET HEALTH NEEDS

The Kerr-Mills bill was enacted by Congress in 1960 as the American Medical Association's answer to the Kennedy administration's proposal to provide hospital care for the aged through social security.

In many respects the Kerr-Mills program is undesirable, especially in that it requires oldsters practically to take a pauper's oath in order to receive aid. And in some States, though not in California, persons getting benefits must give liens on their homes to the Government.

Yet these objections become more or less academic in the light of a congressional report showing the program simply is not meeting the needs of the senior citizens.

The majority membership of the House Subcommittee on Health of the Elderly reported that as late as August fewer than 1 percent of the Nation's old folk were receiving Kerr-Mills benefits.

Said the report: "Except for four States having comprehensive programs (Hawaii, Massachusetts, New York, and North Dakota), benefits are nominal, nonexistent or inadequate."

Up to the close of last year 88 percent of the disbursements of Federal funds under the program had gone to five States—California, New York, Massachusetts, Michigan, and Pennsylvania—which meant the other 45 States got only 12 percent, certainly far from enough to provide more than a drop in the bucket in relation to the needs of the people.

Thus it should be more than obvious the Kerr-Mills program is not an answer but a denial.

If there is to be coverage on a universal and a dignified basis it should be done through prepaid social security. Even the pending program is little enough but it plainly would be superior to a system of handouts which reached only 148,000 elderly people in August, 1963.

And it is a cause for shame that, because of pressure from self-serving groups, Congress has deferred action on this necessary legislation for at least another year. For many people who could be benefited by the program, a year from now will be too late.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader what the schedule will be for the remainder of today and tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the leadership had hoped to get a little more work done, but, unfortunately, because of circumstances beyond our control, we shall be fortunate to dispose of the District of Columbia appropriation bill at this late "Wall Street" hour.

Following the disposition of the pending bill, it is the intention of the leadership to take up Calendar No. 620, H.R. 8747, the independent offices appropriation bill, in order to lay it before the Senate and make it the pending business.

It is anticipated that some time after the disposition of that bill the following measures will be called up:

Calendar No. 614, H.R. 6001, the Waukegan bill; Calendar No. 615, S. 432, and Calendar No. 616, H.R. 6518, the air pollution bills; Calendar No. 617, S. 298, and Calendar No. 618, S. 1309, the small business bills; and Calendar No. 622, Senate Joint Resolution 129, to amend the Housing Act of 1954.

They will be taken up, but not in that order. It is also anticipated that on Wednesday the Senate will consider the so-called bracero bill, and the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to state that I made an unintentional misstatement when I indicated that possibly on Wednesday next the conference report on the legislative appropriation will be taken up. I now wish to inform the Senate that I do not know when it will be taken up, but it will be sometime after Wednesday.

That is about the best I can say at the moment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Do I correctly understand that most of tomorrow will be devoted to the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill and some other bills, I hope.

CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE WOULD DO THE JOB

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators an important editorial in this morning's New York Times entitled, "Controls for the Dollar." Noting the dramatic improvement in our balance of payments in the third quarter, the editorial takes strong exception to the administration's interest equalization tax proposal, and instead, should capital outflow continue at a disturbing rate, it recommends the establishment of a capital issues committee. I fully agree.

As I have stated at least on two occasions in the past the interest equalization tax would not be an effective instrument in dealing with the problem of capital outflows. The decline in capital outflows in the third quarter, in my view, is largely due to the uncertainty created by the pending measure rather than the tax that would be placed on capital exports, should the measure become law. There were other key factors that contributed to the improved third-quarter figures, namely an increase in the rediscount rate and the improved competitive position of U.S. exports, resulting from stable U.S. prices while Western Europe is suffering from inflation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the New York Times editorial dated November 18, 1963, as well as recent articles from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times offering further evidence that what may well be the basic reasons for the recent improvement in the balance of payments.

There being no objection, the article and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1963]

CONTROLS FOR THE DOLLAR

Things are finally looking up in the battle for the dollar. The third-quarter results show a dramatic improvement over the dismal figures for the first half, when the outflow of dollars reached record proportions. A good part of the reduction of the drain is attributable to the administration's proposed tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds, which has a retroactive provision. On the surface, at least, it can be argued that passage of the tax would bring a permanent improvement.

But other factors helped to stem the outflow. The Federal Reserve's increase in the discount rate served to cut down on the short-term capital drain. And American manufacturers seem to be doing better because they have maintained stable prices while Europeans are facing inflationary pressures.

The proposed tax cannot bring as lasting an improvement as a further bettering of basic economic forces that will enhance our competitive position in world markets and attract capital from abroad. It has probably hit the peak of its effectiveness already, because prospective foreign borrowers have been marking time, waiting to see just what restrictions will be written into the bill. If it passes, it will invite a renewed seepage through loopholes that always accompany any new tax.

With competitive forces running in our favor, the administration might get by without any specific instruments to stem a capital outflow. It could rely, for instance, solely on indirect control by another boost in interest rates. But tightening credit might hurt domestic activity and could trigger a rise in foreign rates. France has just raised its discount rate to counter inflation, so that the danger of a general escalation in rates, which might stifle investment, cannot be ignored.

If controls over capital movements are deemed necessary, it would be far more effective to employ direct controls through the establishment of a capital-issues committee to pass on borrowings. This would avoid the creation of new loopholes; it would be temporary and it would not set up an artificial two-price system for funds. Most of all, they could do the job. Controls over capital are as distasteful as any other barrier to liberalized trade, but if they are to be used in the battle to defend the dollar, there should be no doubt about their ability to work.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 18, 1963]
AN ECONOMIC FEINT?—MERE THREAT OF BILL
CUTS PAYMENT GAP; IT MAY NOT WORK IN
CASE OF TAX CUT

(By M. J. Rossant)

The Kennedy administration is enjoying considerable success in hitting upon a novel technique for influencing business without getting congressional approval of proposed changes in the tax structure. The new method can be termed the psychological approach to economic policy.

It may not have been the administration's intention to rely on this technique, but it is apparently impressed with the way it has been working on both the domestic and foreign fronts.

Take the proposed across-the-board reduction of \$11 billion in personal and corporate income taxes. According to administration sources, the anticipation of tax relief is important in causing the high level of business activity.

They say that businessmen and consumers—as well as investors on Wall Street—are

acting as if the Senate Finance Committee had already approved the tax cuts.

DEFICIT PARED

Although it can be argued that the promise of tax relief has had little to do with the rise in business activity, there is no doubt that the proposed interest-equalization tax on American purchases of foreign stocks and bonds worked wonders in reducing the country's balance-of-payments deficit during the third quarter.

In this case, the psychological approach is all that the administration has had to depend on. The proposed tax has not cleared even the House Ways and Means Committee, yet it brought a sharp reduction in the flow of dollars out of the country ticketed for purchases of foreign securities.

The balance of payments is the relationship between payments to foreigners and receipts from foreigners.

During the third quarter, purchases of new foreign issues amounted to \$175 million, or far below the \$520 million that flowed out in the preceding quarter. There is usually a decline from the second to third quarter, but on a seasonally adjusted basis the reduction was still a significant one.

The decline in net purchases of outstanding foreign securities was equally dramatic. According to the Commerce Department, the flowout in this area was "nearly zero," which compares with a drain of \$52 million in the second quarter and \$48 million in the first.

Whatever the merits of the proposed tax, these results cannot be denied. The proposal may be a gimmick, but it is a gimmick that works.

In fact, the results would have been even better if the proposed tax had been introduced earlier in the third quarter. Mr. Kennedy did not propose it until mid-July, and its retroactive provision was not supposed to take effect before mid-August, so that its impact covered only half of the period.

Unless Congress speeds its timetable, the proposed tax will have a full opportunity to show what it can do in the fourth quarter. If it remains a mere proposal, the prospect is that the flowout will be reduced to an inconsequential trickle.

Treasury officials are said to be against any delay in passing the proposed tax. But their eagerness for action is open to question, because the present uncertainty surrounding the proposal is much more effective in stemming the long-term capital flow than any tax could hope to be.

IMAGE CAST BY NOTHING

The proposed tax resembles the fable about the emperor's new clothes. They didn't exist, but almost no one would challenge the image.

If the proposed tax becomes law, foreign borrowers and American lenders will no longer be in the dark. They will be able to take advantage of loopholes that are sure to be devised.

There is no telling how much money will then go into foreign securities in one way or another, but it is bound to be more than the present negligible flow.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 11, 1963]

EUROPE'S LURE DIMS—FEWER YANKEE DOLLARS
CROSS ATLANTIC TO BUILD FACTORIES IN OLD
WORLD—ECONOMIC GROWTH IN FRANCE,
GERMANY NOW TRAILS UNITED STATES;
PROFIT RISE SLOWS SHARPLY—AIDING BAL-
ANCE OF PAYMENTS?

(By Alfred L. Malabre, Jr.)

The great fever to invest in Europe has cooled.

Behind the cooling is a little-noticed pattern of very basic economic fact. The much-publicized business expansion in most West European countries now lags behind growth in the United States. And corporate

profits in Europe are rising much less swiftly than in America.

"Nowadays, when a company asks us how best to tap the European market, we're much slower to advise setting up overseas production than we were a few years ago," says a Chase Manhattan Bank officer whose job is to assist Chase customers wishing to sell their products overseas. His go-slow advice is fairly typical of the counsel many business consultants are giving Europe-minded customers.

The outpouring of investment funds to build plants in Europe long has worried administration officials concerned over the Nation's nagging balance-of-payments deficit. These funds make up roughly half of America's total direct investment outflow. They constitute a major part of the payments deficit, which occurs because Americans spend more abroad than foreigners do in the United States.

DIRECT INVESTMENTS DROP

The latest Government statistics indicate many businessmen may indeed be adopting a go-slow attitude to new European investments. At last report in the second quarter, U.S. direct investments in Western Europe totaled \$137 million, only a third of the first quarter outflow and only half as high as in the comparable 1962 period. The latest figure, in fact, is lower than in any 3-month period since early 1961.

Talks with plant location consultants also point to a recent slowdown. "The inquiries we're getting from American companies wishing to set up facilities in Europe are running about 20 percent behind a year ago," reports Leonard C. Yaseen, senior partner of Fantus Co., a New York-based location consultant with offices in Europe. "This is in contrast to our domestic business, which is up sharply from 1962."

It's too soon, of course, to ascertain whether the recent slowdown signals the start of a prolonged decline of U.S. investment in Europe. A renewed spurt of Europe's economic growth could trigger a fresh flow of U.S. funds across the Atlantic. So could failure of United States-European efforts to pare trade restrictions; with high tariff walls to hurdle, many U.S. exporters would be forced to set up production overseas or abandon the European market.

Most economists who keep close tabs on foreign investments, however, doubt the slowdown is merely temporary. "Some of the great attractions European production once held for U.S. companies are fast being wiped out," says a Commerce Department analyst. "With these gone, there's bound to be a letup in the investment flow."

SLOWER EUROPEAN EXPANSION

Among the foremost of these attractions has been the fast economic growth of Western Europe, relative to expansion in the United States. But now, the record clearly shows, most European lands are actually expanding more slowly than America.

The table below traces the economic growth of major European countries and the United States since the start of 1962. Industrial production—an economic index based largely on physical measures and therefore not easily distorted by inflation—is the yardstick used.

Output gain	Percent
Italy.....	12
Belgium.....	11
United States.....	10
Germany.....	9
France.....	9
Spain.....	9
Netherlands.....	6
Britain.....	5
Austria.....	5
Sweden.....	3

Of the nine European countries listed, only Italy and Belgium have recently expanded

faster than the United States, the table shows. And even in these two countries, the output rise has slowed markedly in the last few months. Says an economist for a large New York bank: "Who would have dreamed several years ago that the United States would soon be growing faster than nations like West Germany and France?"

Other attractions Europe has held for many U.S. corporations are relatively low production costs and high profits. But these lures also are fading rapidly, talks with businessmen and other observers indicate.

THE GAP IS CLOSING

"When we began producing in Europe some years ago, the cost of turning out a given item over there was only about 75 percent as high as in the United States," recalls Henry F. Brockschmidt, a vice president of Perkin-Elmer Corp., a scientific instrument maker. "Now, it costs at least 90 percent as much and the gap is closing."

Labor is the chief cause of Europe's climbing production costs, most analysts agree. Unlike the United States where labor expense per unit of production has actually declined 3 percentage points in 3 years, Europe's hourly wage levels are rising far faster than the hourly output, or productivity, of European workers.

In Germany, for instance, labor costs per unit of output have swelled about 25 percent since 1959. In the Netherlands and Italy, the rise amounts to approximately 20 percent. In France and Britain, it is nearly 15 percent.

The spiral of European labor costs will probably continue, most observers predict. They reason that labor shortages overseas will surely become more acute as the 1960's unfold. Studies by Bela Belassa, who teaches economics at Yale, forecast the size of Germany's labor supply will be no larger in 1970 than at present. This is because the postwar birth rate in war-ravaged Germany was extraordinarily low, unlike the postwar rate in America.

The labor picture emerging elsewhere in Western Europe is not very different from the German situation, says Mr. Belassa. He predicts the yearly growth of the entire area's labor force between now and 1970 will be less than 1 percent, or only half the projected annual rise in the United States.

"The increasing strains on Europe's labor supply are bound to hurt the area's investment appeal," concludes Mr. Belassa.

Adding to Europe's labor woes is the fact that strikes abound, despite the spiraling wage levels. Example: Some 2 million French public utility workers recently marched off their jobs in a 1-day warning strike to demand higher pay; the walkout left most of Paris without electricity.

FEWER U.S. STRIKES

Labor-management relations in the United States, by comparison, are becoming more tranquil. In the first half of this year, only 540,000 U.S. workers were involved in strikes, reports the Labor Department. That's fewer than in any like period since World War II.

Climbing costs are squeezing the profits of many European operations, reports indicate. "A few years ago, our profits amounted to as much as 10 percent of sales at our European production facilities," says Perkin-Elmer's Mr. Brockschmidt. "Currently, our margins abroad are down in the 5 to 7 percent range." He adds, "Labor shortages are a big problem."

A recent survey by Fortune suggest the pressure on profits abroad. In 1962, the magazine reports, aggregate after-tax profits of the 100 largest foreign industrial concerns, mostly West European, were less than 1 percent higher than those of the top 100 a year earlier. This near plateau of profits occurred despite an 11-percent sales increase, the survey states.

CLIMBING U.S. PROFITS

The profit picture in America is markedly different. After-tax corporate earnings in the United States reached a record \$24.6 billion in 1962, some 13 percent higher than in 1961, and recent reports show the rise is continuing. At the same time, U.S. profit margins are climbing sharply; the latest Government figures show second quarter profits of American manufacturers amounted to 5 percent of sales, up from 3.5 percent as recently as early 1961.

Though the chief cause of the investment slowdown is hard economics, other considerations also are involved, many analysts contend. For example, some companies apparently are betting trade barriers between Europe and the United States ultimately will be hauled down. Also, economists say, recently toughened rules on taxation of some Europe-based operations may discourage would-be investors.

Another deterrent is simply the vast size of the stake U.S. companies already have in Western Europe. Their European plant facilities are now worth nearly \$10 billion, up from \$4 billion as recently as 1957. The current stake is nearly as large as U.S. companies' worldwide direct investments abroad only a dozen years ago.

LESS WELCOME ABROAD?

"Many American corporations that should logically set up production in Europe have already done so; now, they're able to support further overseas projects with funds earned abroad," says an officer of New York's First National City Bank. "In addition, there are areas in Europe where the U.S. interest has grown so large that the foreign nations concerned are becoming less welcoming hosts to new investments."

Just as Europe's economic problems appear to discourage some new investments from the United States, so America's rising business strength may eventually prompt more European concerns to build plants in the United States, some economists forecast.

There's little in the record, however, to indicate a marked increase of direct investments from Europe is already underway. In the second quarter, West European concerns put \$27 million into U.S. facilities, up from their first quarter investment but slightly less than in the like 1962 period, and far below the \$137 million second quarter flow from U.S. companies to Europe.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 11, 1963]

TRADING DEFICIT RISES IN EUROPE—COMMON MARKET REPORTS AN EXCESS OF IMPORTS

(By Edward T. O'Toole)

BRUSSELS, November 10.—The deficit in the European Common Market's balance of trade—the excess of imports over exports—for the first 9 months of 1963 will be about \$900 million greater than in the 1962 period.

This could mean balance-of-payments trouble for the trade bloc in the future.

An analysis released here over the weekend by the executive commission of the European Community added that the 9-month trade deficit trend had continued into the autumn months.

"The expansion of exports to nonmember countries slackened somewhat," the study said, "while on the import side the autumn recovery proved relatively vigorous."

Unless capital imports compensate for the net outflow of funds caused by the trade deficit, balance-of-payments problems can be expected to develop.

The rising trade deficit of the Common Market six—West Germany, France, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg—comes at a time when capital imports are increasing owing to the Kennedy administration's dollar defense program introduced last summer.

Taken together, these two trends could spell stormy weather for the Community unless countermeasures are adopted.

One such measure normally expected would be an increase in interest rates here to attract new capital imports. But the Common Market has a gentleman's agreement with the United States that it will not offset, by increasing its interest rates here, the rise in U.S. interest rates that the Kennedy administration put into effect last summer.

The chief reason for the community's 1963 trade deficit has been increased imports by France. Unlike a similar increase in West Germany, the rise in French imports was not accompanied by a compensating increase in exports.

With internal prices also pushing upward as a result of inflationary pressures, France will be hard put to expand her imports in the future without some drastic form of price controls. Such action could disturb the balance of trade of the other Common Market members, with corresponding disturbing effects on their economies.

OVERSEA INVESTMENTS UP

U.S. companies with heavy investments in oversea operations are continuing to add to those investments at a rapid rate, according to a survey released today by McKinsey & Co., Inc.

The international management consultant found in its survey of 100 major industrial companies, that oversea assets had risen by 18 percent in 1962. At the same time, the domestic assets of these companies increased by only 6 percent.

There were, however, some signs that the returns on oversea investment, which had been accelerating far more rapidly than returns on domestic investment, were leveling off.

FOREIGN SALES RISE

The 100 companies, which had aggregate sales of about \$60 billion last year, have increased their foreign sales 275 percent since 1950. At the same time, their domestic volume has risen by 40 percent, according to the McKinsey report.

Last year, however, their oversea sales increased 9 percent, while their domestic revenue rose by 10 percent.

Concurrently, the profits on foreign investments have been dropping back closer to the margin on domestic business. The return on foreign direct investments dropped to 14 percent last year from a high of 18 percent in 1955.

The return is still larger than that on domestic operations, but the margin of difference is growing smaller. Domestic profits increased by 15 percent last year, while oversea profits rose an average of 8 percent.

SUBSIDIARIES INCREASE

One of the more revealing findings of the McKinsey report is that the U.S. companies are pressing the conversion of their foreign sales from exports to sales made by oversea subsidiaries.

Since 1950, the 100 companies increased the production of their oversea plants by 420 percent. Last year, foreign production rose 19 percent while export volume grew by 8 percent.

The companies surveyed, McKinsey acknowledged, are those with exceptionally high interests in the international arena and not representative of all U.S. industry.

However, Gilber H. Clee, director of the consulting concern's oversea activities, noted that "the fact that these companies have continued—and in many cases even increased—the pace of their expansion overseas is evidence that the full-scale participation in the world economy has become part of their long-term strategic planning. This means that more and more U.S. companies are becoming true world enterprises."

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1963]
GE INCREASING ITS EXPORT SALES—CUSTOM SERVICE IS STRESSED FOR BIG TRANSFORMERS
(By Philip Shabecoff)

"It costs a little more but the quality is worth it."

This kind of slogan is familiar in advertising of consumer products such as coffee or cigarettes, but it would hardly seem to be a suitable merchandising approach for huge electric power machinery.

Yet it is with exactly this technique that the transformer division of the General Electric Co. has increased its export sales nearly 80 percent in the last 3 years.

Despite prices that are slightly higher than those of its competitors in England, Germany and Switzerland, GE's transformer division has raised its export sales by well over \$7 million in 3 years and has taken more than 19 percent of the free world market for power converters.

It has done so by stressing custom service and quick delivery to its customers in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and South America.

Transformers are giant devices, costing as much as several hundred thousand dollars each, that convert electricity from one voltage to another. Most European manufacturers, who until recently controlled 90 percent of the world export market for them, manufacture these transformers according to standard specifications, Donald Sampson, export director for GE's transformer division, said.

However, mechanization of GE's transformer plants at Pittsfield, Mass., Rome, Ga., and Hickory, N.C., together with the use of computers in designing the devices, has enabled the division to design transformers efficiently and quickly to the customer's specifications, Mr. Sampson said.

"With our computers, one of our engineers can ask for 15 new transformer designs in the morning and have them on his desk by lunch," the GE executive declared.

With this versatility, the division was able to go after small specialized jobs wherever they appeared. It found customers throughout the world who were willing to pay a little extra for a transformer built to meet their specialized needs or who wanted quick delivery.

A GE official asserted that the division is able to fill orders within 2 to 7 months, whereas European suppliers take from 12 to 15 months to deliver an order.

UNUSUAL PROBLEMS

GE's flexibility has enabled it to cope with some bizarre problems. In India, the division's biggest customer this year, many railway tunnels are narrow and dome shaped. They were originally built to convey British troops and presented an effective roadblock for the huge transformers.

GE engineers devised a simple answer to this problem. They shipped the transformers in narrow, dome-shaped packages.

For some areas, where power station sites are inaccessible by road or rail, the division has provided transformers broken down into small packages that can be carried on a man's back. These packages are accompanied by do-it-yourself assembly instructions.

The acceleration of the transformer division's export sales came at a time when extra sales were badly needed. By 1959, the U.S. electrical industry was confronted with a severe excess capacity. Because of this overproduction and also because of antitrust litigation, transformer prices were plunging.

At the same time, competition from European imports was getting stiffer. At one point in the 1950's, European exports accounted for 12 percent of transformer sales in the domestic market.

POSITION IMPROVED

However, the excess capacity and the falling prices put U.S. transformers in a better competitive position vis-a-vis the European products.

With their improved competitive position, therefore, GE, Westinghouse, and other U.S. manufacturers were able to recapture the initiative in the domestic market. European products now account for only about 2 percent of sales in the United States.

Mr. Sampson said that it was unlikely that GE would be able to make a significant dent in the European market, which is tightly controlled by domestic industries there. Except for some sales in Italy, GE makes virtually no shipments of transformers to Western Europe.

However, GE is sanguine about future export possibilities in the developing countries of the world. It believes it will continue to improve its competitive position in world trade as European production costs rise.

The transformer division hopes to double its export sales within the next 4 years.

A SUMMARY REPORT ON THE NINTH ANNUAL PLENARY SESSION OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS CONFERENCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, because I had to preside over the Economic Committee as Chairman on 2 days of its meeting, November 4 and 5, I was the only Member of the Senate to attend the Ninth Annual Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference held in Paris on November 4-8. I shall try to give a brief summary of the deliberations which took place. For the information of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at this point, the report of the Economic Committee, including its five recommendations which were adopted at the plenary session on November 8.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

The Economic Committee, having met on July 12 jointly with the Working Party on Latin America, met again during the week of the annual session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

As a result of its work, the Committee is submitting five recommendations to the Conference, which were adopted unanimously by the Committee.

PREPARATORY WORK

This satisfactory result was made possible largely through the preliminary meeting of the Committee and the essential staff work undertaken in the period between the eighth and ninth annual conferences.

Country-by-country reviews were submitted by the following countries: Belgium, France, the German Federal Republic, the United States of America, and Canada.

Staff papers were also submitted by officers and members of the Committee. The Committee notes especially in this connection the following papers:

"Problems of the Transport Sector," by Senator J. van Buggenhout.

"The Economic Implications of Outer Space," prepared according to the instructions of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"The Problem of Primary Commodities," report presented by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"Multilateral Investment Guarantees," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"The International Monetary System and World Economic Growth," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"An East-West Trade Code," submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS.

"Proposals for German Emergency Legislation in Connection with Civil Emergency Planning, With Special Reference to Power Supply Problems," submitted by Prof. F. Burgbacher.

"The Problem of Atlantic Trade," by Dr. Kurt Birrenbach.

"Report on Action Implementing Economic Committee Recommendation III (The Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA))."

Comments by member governments on Committee papers were also presented by Senator JOHN J. CONNELLY, of Canada, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of the United States.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The first recommendation recognizes the success of the Conference in sponsoring the ADELA project and requests that the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts in pursuing the objectives of an ADELA Investment Company until such time as it acquires legal status; thereupon invites the OECD, IADB, and OAS to assume responsibility for the continuation of the policy which led to this initiative; and calls for the continuance of the Working Party and for it to report to the President of the Conference on the fulfillment of its initial terms of reference when the organization of the ADELA Investment Company has been provided for.

The second recommendation reiterates the importance of achieving implementation of the recommendation I of the eighth annual Conference. This deals with the question of trade with the Soviet bloc and harmonization of policies in respect of it.

The third recommendation draws attention to the manner in which nontariff barriers inhibit international trade. It covers such matters as quotas, discriminatory regulations, customs evaluation and nomenclature, and other regulations and practices which act as barriers to trade. The recommendation emphasizes the importance of these restrictions on trade during a period when the Kennedy round of trade negotiations is about to take place.

The fourth recommendation, perhaps, the most important of all, urges member Governments to give their support to a solution to the problem of the temporary imbalance of payments of major countries in the Alliance. This problem, if left unsolved, will continue to affect not only the rate of growth of the developed countries but the living standards of the peoples of the underdeveloped free world.

The fifth recommendation requests authority to set up a Working Party to study and make recommendations of measures to accelerate the development of the less developed countries in the Alliance; no expenditure is called for in connection with such authority.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The following were unanimously reelected: Chairman, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS (United States of America); Vice Chairman, Prof. Fritz Burgbacher (Federal Republic of Germany); Rapporteur, Mr. Anthony Kershaw, Member of Parliament (United Kingdom).

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting the report on the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), as carried out under the NATO Parliamentarians' Working Party in implementation of Economic Committee recommendation III, approved by the eighth plenary session,

November 16, 1962; approving of the actions recorded in the aforementioned report; expressing appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary General of the OECD, the President of the IADB, the Secretary General of the OAS, the Members of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee and Working Party, and the personnel of ADELA, and for the cooperation of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who acted with Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, as U.S. cosponsor of the ADELA program, and of other officials, both public and private, in member nations of the OECD and Latin America; declaring that the cooperative efforts to prepare an action program to meet the economic, social, and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom are expected to continue with the support and assistance of the OECD, IADB, and OAS; recommends:

1. that the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts for 6 months with respect to the ADELA project; and

2. the Working Party be authorized to invite the OECD, IADB, and OAS to take over its responsibilities as soon as possible; and

3. upon consummation of steps 1 and 2, the Working Party to submit its closing report concerning completion of its mission to the President of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that its recommendation No. I adopted by the plenary session of the eighth annual Conference in 1962 on the subject of trade with the Soviet bloc has not been adequately implemented, and recognizing further that developments since the eighth Conference make it even more essential in the interests of free world economic strength to harmonize if possible the trade policies of the member countries with respect to the Soviet bloc including such policies as credit terms, patents and copyrights, status of traders, arbitration of disputes, and trade practices; recommends:

That member governments and the North Atlantic Council be called upon to implement recommendation No. I on East-West Trade adopted at the eighth annual Conference and to advise the Conference as to such implementation.

Recommendation III

The Conference recognizing the need to strengthen the economies of the developing and developed free world countries by providing opportunities for trade and recognizing that nontariff barriers to trade continue to inhibit trade, and recognizing that important negotiations to reduce barriers to trade and to expand trade will take place in 1964; recommends:

That nontariff barriers to trade be considered especially by the member countries and the North Atlantic Council with a view to reducing the burden of such nontariff barriers upon trade and that such nontariff barriers be a prime object of trade and tariff negotiations to be undertaken among the members of the GATT at Geneva in 1964 and of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference in that year.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, while welcoming the development in international techniques designed to deal with temporary monetary imbalances, states its conviction that the problem of the balance of payments is of the highest importance to the prosperity of the free world and especially the living standards of the people of the undeveloped countries and further, that the failure to provide adequate international liquidity impairs the defense effort of the nations of NATO; urges the NATO Council to give further consideration to its recommendation VI adopted by the plenary session of the Eighth Annual Conference; calls upon the member governments to lend every support to the active

consideration of this problem by the International Monetary Fund and the Paris Club in their impending study, and by other international agencies and institutions, and for concrete recommendations on how best to deal with the problem of international liquidity and imbalances in international payments in the interests of freedom and free world economic prosperity.

Recommendation V

The Conference recognizing the success of the Conference in the ADELA project, is encouraged in seeking a similar initiative in the NATO area and therefore calls for the designation by the Chairman, subject to the approval of the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of a Working Party to be appointed by leaders of the respective delegations acting in an official capacity, to include Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Iceland, United Kingdom, United States, Germany, the Netherlands, and Canada; to study and make recommendations of action which should be taken to accelerate the development of the less developed countries within the NATO Alliance itself.

Mr. JAVITS. A number of reports were submitted by members of the Economic Committee itself. From the U.S. point of view, I would say that the reports and recommendations dealing with East-West trade and the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America—ADELA—are of prime interest. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have these reports inserted at this point of the proceedings.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EAST-WEST TRADE CODE

(Submitted by Senator JACOB K. JAVITS)

The question of East-West trade, which has been a significant element of the East-West policy confrontation since the Second World War, has taken on new importance within the past year for two reasons: first, its volume is expanding, and second, there is evidence that the Soviet Union attaches new importance to possible liberalization of the prevailing restraints which the West, and particularly the United States, has applied to such trade.

In the last 10 years, the trade exchange (imports and exports) between the free world countries and the Soviet bloc has grown from slightly more than \$3 billion in 1952 to over \$10 billion in 1962. This volume is still, of course, a very small percentage of total world trade, and the U.S. share has been so small as to be insignificant by any quantitative standard. U.S. exports to the Soviet Union in 1962 were only \$20 million, while the exports of other free world industrialized countries amounted to \$1.2 billion. U.S. exports to the Eastern European satellite countries in 1962 amounted to \$105 million (\$95 million to Poland), while exports from all free world industrialized countries were valued at \$1.7 billion.

In aggregate terms, this trade is of minor significance to the Soviet bloc. Total imports from nonbloc sources represent less than 1 percent of Soviet gross national product. Imports from the industrialized non-bloc countries, which would provide machinery and equipment of principal value to the Soviet economy, represent only one-half of 1 percent of Soviet GNP.

This trade obviously could not appreciably affect the Soviet Union's military capability or long-term economic growth. Soviet military capability is based on its own advanced weapons technology. The Soviet Union would be no more likely to become dependent upon Western sources for military

designs and production than the United States would be inclined to rely on Soviet sources for American military development.

This leaves the question of whether the total denial of Western exports to the Soviet Union might appreciably affect Soviet economic growth. It seems highly unlikely that this would be possible because Soviet industry is broadly based on domestic materials and resources for which the Soviets are not dependent upon imports from the West. As far as its agricultural sector is concerned, Soviet difficulties there are basically the result of institutional defects which are so ingrained in the Communist system that it is difficult to visualize how they could be cured short of abandoning the Communist system of economic organization itself. This in fact is what has happened in the Communist countries which have made progress in agriculture. In Poland and Yugoslavia agricultural production has been placed on an almost completely free and individual basis, and this is a development we certainly should welcome. In the Soviet Union problems of inadequate incentives, ineffective procurement and distribution, and the inefficiencies inherent in collectivized or state farming are the governing factors, rather than specific import requirements from the West.

For all these reasons, the denial of Western exports to the Soviet Union might at most have a short-term disruptive effect on Soviet economic planning at a given time, if a ban were imposed for reasons growing out of serious new East-West tensions. Trade with the West as a general matter, however, must necessarily be a marginal factor in the performance and potentialities of the Soviet economy.

There is, of course, a qualitative factor which enters the equation. The Soviet bloc countries find it cheaper in terms of the disposition of their resources in some instances to add to capacity through imports of modern plants and technology than to build all the additional facilities foreseen in their long-range planning themselves. At the same time, the ability of the Soviet Union and the other Soviet bloc countries to import from the industrialized West has been sharply limited by sparse export capabilities, although the bloc has continued to use appreciable amounts of scarce foreign exchange to purchase foodstuffs and industrial materials of a purely expendable nature as contrasted with capital equipment or prototypes. In 1962, for example, the Soviet Union used \$4 million of foreign exchange to purchase tallow in the United States.

The fact that East-West trade is of marginal importance in aggregate terms either to the East or to the West does not erase the fact that this marginal contribution is viewed as having a certain economic importance by both sides. Resort to imports involves a timesaving factor for the bloc which facilitates adherence to production schedules and realization of plan targets. Trade with the West is thus of sufficient importance to the Soviets that they would prefer to continue to rely upon this marginal adjustment mechanism of importing from the industrialized countries if it can conveniently be arranged, particularly if credit can be used to cover the capital equipment component of such trade. For the major trading countries of the West, the record is quite clear that they regard orders from the Soviet bloc as having commercial and political importance from their own standpoint, especially in industries subject to underemployment.

Apart from the economic and strategic factors summarized above, the political and psychological importance to the Soviet bloc of Western controls is substantial. This sensitivity on the part of the Soviet bloc countries to what they regard as discriminatory treatment by the West suggests the

utility of East-West trade relationships as a possible bargaining area under certain circumstances.

In analyzing the problem of East-West trade from the standpoint of the national interest over the years since the Second World War, the United States has viewed that interest as being involved in four particular areas:

First, the possible strategic contribution of exports to the bloc; second, the use by the bloc of trade and related long-term credits as a means of penetrating the less-developed countries in ways that may threaten the growth of independent regimes; third, the potentialities available to the bloc to disrupt world markets; and, fourth, the possibility that certain of the Western Allies may become unduly dependent upon Soviet bloc supplies or markets.

A variety of actions and programs have been undertaken over the years to minimize these risks. The multilateral Coordinating Committee (Cocom) program has placed agreed restraints on strategic exports and on the control of transshipments. The foreign assistance program in collaboration with the foreign aid programs of other Western countries has been used as flexibly as possible to counter Soviet penetration in less developed countries and to augment Western influence. The new and uncommitted countries have been encouraged to associate themselves with the multilateral trade and financial institutions and the Western system of international trade and payments. Joint Western efforts have been made to deal with such special problems of trade vulnerability as those involving Greece or Turkey. Soviet activities in international commodity markets such as oil or tin have been the subject of Western collaboration. Efforts have been made through international commodity studies or agreements to meet the marketing problems of less developed countries and reduce their vulnerability to Soviet bilateral trade machinations.

The Western response to the problems of trade with the Soviet bloc must continue to be both varied and flexible. There is no single solution to the problem of protecting the national interest in this field. One channel of action, which has been increasingly discussed in recent years, might be the development of a code of trading practices which would have the effect of limiting the scope for disruptive activities by the Soviet bloc and at the same time prescribing a more satisfactory basis for commercial dealings between market economy and state trading countries. Such a code need not try to cover all questions at issue in East-West trade. It should, however, serve as a guide and as a unifying influence for free world countries in their bilateral trade relations with bloc countries. It might evolve into a concrete set of proposals that could be presented for agreement to the bloc countries. It would be advisable to explore such a proposal first with the countries aligned in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization since they include most of the principal trading countries having important trading relationships with the bloc.

In addition to reaching agreements among Western countries on a common trade code to be proposed to the Soviet bloc, Western countries should also harmonize their policies on extending credits to the bloc. Their aim should be to limit the terms of such credits so as not to allow the U.S.S.R. and other Soviet bloc countries undue flexibility in continuing essential hard currency imports despite balance-of-payments problems. The effect of longer term credits to the bloc would be to permit the bloc countries to defer the surrender of gold, foreign assets, or hard currency exports and thus to have a very free hand in planning their allocation of internal resources. It would be well nigh ludicrous for the NATO countries to be giv-

ing the Soviets better credit terms than are permitted to less developed countries of the free world.

A proposed code follows:

"CODE OF FAIR PRACTICES IN INTERNATIONAL TRADE"

"1. FACILITATING ACCESS TO MARKETS"

"Each government shall permit the entry into and residence and travel within its territory of bona fide foreign commercial representatives and salesmen, for the purpose of the normal conduct of their business, including, inter alia:

"(a) Opportunity to procure suitable facilities such as office space, warehouse space, space for the public display of merchandise, and facilitation for the post-sales maintenance and servicing of their products.

"(b) Access to importing and exporting interests, banks, insurance companies, publicity and advertising media, and postal and other communications facilities.

"(c) Freedom to bring in advertising material and samples, and to disseminate the same within the national territory.

"(d) Freedom to bring in or employ locally interpreters, translators, secretaries, accountants, technical experts, and legal counsel.

"2. PUBLICATION OF LAWS, REGULATIONS, AND STATISTICS"

"Each government shall publish promptly all laws, regulations, judicial decisions and administrative decisions affecting foreign trade, and adequately detailed statistics regarding foreign trade, in such a manner as to enable governments and traders to become acquainted with them.

"3. PATENT AND COPYRIGHT PROTECTION"

"Each country shall observe equitable standards of patent and copyright protection, and shall maintain procedures so that foreign nationals are able in practice to obtain adequate, prompt, and effective compensation for the use of their industrial and intellectual property.

"4. RULES ON STATE TRADING"

"In a country which maintains any state enterprise with exclusive, or special privileges regarding purchases or sales (other than purchases purely for governmental use) such enterprises shall make any purchases and sales involving imports or exports solely in accordance with commercial considerations, such as price, quality, availability, marketability, transportation costs and other conditions, and foreign enterprises shall be afforded adequate opportunity to compete on an equal basis in State purchases and sales abroad. Such State enterprises shall not claim sovereign immunity with respect to their commercial operations.

"5. SWITCHING OF PROCUREMENT"

"Each government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises shall not arbitrarily change sources of imports for purely political reasons in such a manner as to disrupt the normal marketing arrangements of supplying countries.

"6. REEXPORTATION"

"Each Government shall insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not reexport a commodity imported from another country at a price lower than that at which it was originally exported, and do not make reexports contrary to the laws and regulations of the country of origin.

"7. DUMPING AND MARKET DISRUPTION"

"Each government shall establish or maintain procedures to insure that its agencies or state trading enterprises do not introduce products into the commerce of another country at such prices, in such quantities, or at such a rate as to cause or threaten serious injury to an established industry in the latter country.

"8. SETTLEMENT OF COMMERCIAL DISPUTES"

"Each government shall facilitate the use of arbitration in the settlement of disputes that arise in the course of international commerce. To that end, each government shall avoid taking any action to prevent the inclusion in agreements of provisions for settlement of such disputes in third countries or for the appointment of arbitrators who are nationals of third countries."

"9. CONSULTATION"

"Each government shall accord sympathetic consideration to, and shall afford adequate opportunity for, consultation regarding such representations as may be made by another government with respect to any matter affecting the operation of this code."

REPORT ON ACTION IMPLEMENTING ECONOMIC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION III—THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP FOR LATIN AMERICA (ADELA)

At the September 1962 meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Economic Committee, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Chairman, presented a preliminary report on Western European participation in Latin American development. In discussion of this report, it was decided to have a more complete presentation prepared for the Economic Committee meeting in November 1962 and on this basis to submit recommendations for action by the plenary session.

The November 1962 report, "The Role of the OECD in the Economic Development of Latin America" (Doc. E. 129), and recommendation III of the Economic Committee were adopted by the plenary session on November 16, 1962. To implement this recommendation, that the "private and public sectors of the member nations of the OECD" be enlisted in an accelerated development program for Latin America in coordination with the Alliance for Progress, a Working Party was appointed at the plenary session. Under the chairmanship of Mr. JAVITS, the members of the Working Party are: M. Lucien Radoux (Belgium); M. Claude Roux (France); Dr. Kurt Birrenbach (Germany); Mr. Giuseppe Vedovato (Italy); Miss W. van Stoeuwen (Netherlands); Mr. Anthony Kershaw (United Kingdom); Mr. John Hall (alternate).

Subsequently, four additional members were appointed to the Working Party: Mr. Herb Gray (Canada); Mr. Helland (Norway); M. Tavares (Portugal); M. Gulek (Turkey).

The Working Party convened for its first meeting on April 5, 1963, in Paris. Present were: Mr. Hall, Mr. Javits, Dr. Aurelio Peccei (for Mr. Vedovato), M. Roux, and Dr. Hellmuth Wagner (for Dr. Birrenbach).¹ Mr. Radoux came personally to Paris on April 7, was informed by Dr. Peccei of the actions taken, and concurred. All regular and alternate members subsequently received a report from the Chairman.

In accordance with the discussion at this Working Party meeting, the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA) was organized the following day—April 6. Headquartered in Paris, ADELA has as Executive Directors Dr. Aurelio Peccei for Europe, Dr. Julio Gonzales del Solar (European representative of the Inter-American Development Bank) for Latin America, and Mr. Warren Wilhelm for the United States. Serving as advisers to ADELA are Prof. Milton Katz (Harvard University), and Dr. Felipe Herrera (President, Inter-American Development Bank). Mr. Herbert J. Blitz is Executive Secretary to

ADELA. An advisory committee from business, banking, the foundations, and universities, serves in the United States (principals: George Moore, Emilio Collado). Modest financing has been provided by Ford Foundation and U.S. business, in order to support the office and other staff functions of ADELA.

Continuing liaison has been established by ADELA with the Inter-American Development Bank, the Organization of American States, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Finance Corporation, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), as well as the following institutions and organizations, among others: The Development Assistance Committee to the OECD; the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the OECD; the Atlantic Institute; and the Committee for European Cooperation with Latin America (CECAL), established on the recommendation of the International Christian Union of Business Executives (UNIAPAC) Forum.

In June of 1963, the Chairman of the Economic Committee submitted a report—F.51EC(63)4—on ADELA to the Standing Committee of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference.

On July 12, 1963, a joint meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians' Economic Committee and the Working Party on Latin America was held at NATO headquarters in Paris. At this meeting the Executive Directors and the Executive Secretary of ADELA attended in order to present an interim progress report. The meeting approved the work done up to that date, including the proposals for the establishment of a multinational investment company and for efforts to bring European, Canadian, and U.S. technical and managerial skills into Latin America. A document drawn up on September 16, 1963, outlines the ADELA Investment Co. proposal and is available as an Economic Committee document.

The joint meeting also adopted a resolution that ADELA "call a conference on November 8 to 10, to consider the recommendations of ADELA as authorized by the Working Party of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference"; and "that the Executive Directors of ADELA be directed to coordinate their activities with a member of the Working Party in each country." Although ADELA's work has been proceeding at a pace more rapid than contemplated and is achieving concrete results, circumstances beyond ADELA's control necessitate a delay in holding the Conference until mid-December 1963.

It is expected that the structure of the proposed multinational investment company, described in the background documents referred to above, will be set up in a few months. At the mid-December Conference, it is hoped to form an organizing company which would draw up the charter of the investment company and find suitable management for its operation. It is expected that the investment company itself will be come operational during the spring of 1964. The Conference will be held under the auspices of ADELA and would place the formation of the organizing company within the broad framework of the original ADELA objectives, approved by the Working Party; i.e., the preparation of recommendations and an action plan designed to harness increased private and public sector participation of OECD member nations to programs meeting the economic, social and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom. The proposed investment company, if successfully organized, would represent a concrete achievement in accordance with the original objectives of ADELA.

It is expected, with the formation of the organizing company as the hard core around which the ADELA program can be built, that support and assistance for ADELA activities

can be assumed by the OECD, IADB, and OAS. This result would implement the intent of the Economic Committee Recommendation III (approved November 16, 1962), to the effect that the Secretary General of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and the President of the Inter-American Development Bank, in coordination with the Secretary General of the Organization of American States * * * enlist the private and public sectors of the member nations of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in an accelerated development program in Latin America * * *. Thus, the direct advisory responsibility of the NATO Parliamentarians' Working Party would be transferred to the above organizations, with the nonprofit ADELA group acting as liaison with the organizing company and, later, the investment company.

In accordance with this transfer of responsibilities, the Chairman of the Economic Committee and the Working Party has received communications from the principal officers of the IADB and OAS. Pertinent excerpts follow:

President Felipe Herrera (communication dated October 17, 1963): "After the very fruitful conversations that I had the pleasure of having during the last few weeks with you, with the Executive Directors of ADELA, and with groups of businessmen and financiers from Europe, the United States, and Latin America, I believe it is useful for me to reiterate to you some of my viewpoints on your valuable initiative of fostering closer links between European and Latin American private interests."

"I think that the formula proposed by the Executive Directors of ADELA of creating a multilateral private investment company to operate in Latin America could constitute a valuable contribution toward attaining the goals which are being sought. This formula could very well complement other formulas falling within the wider concept of strengthening the overall economic and financial relationships of Europe and Latin America. Within this wider approach, the Inter-American Development Bank has been working in several concrete directions, including placing of bond issues in European markets, selling to European bankers participations in its loans, using its facilities to undertake the administration of trust funds, and arranging financial operations parallel to IADB loans in Latin American countries."

"I understand that important progress has been made on the basic idea. I believe that after this first stage, that is, once expressions of interest by an important group of financiers and businessmen to create a financial institution of the type suggested have been clearly obtained, it would be appropriate to enter into a more detailed analysis of the formal structure of the financial institution to be established, as well as of its position vis-a-vis inter-American regional organizations like ours, and vis-a-vis other international financial organizations."

"As to the formal definition of the relationships between the Bank and the institution that might be created, I wish to reiterate that we are completely open to exploring the several alternatives that could be presented. We know that two criteria have already been defined. On the one hand, there are those who consider that an institution of the nature of ADELA should be completely independent of any intergovernmental organization. On the other hand, there are those that rather believe that an initiative of this kind should have originated from the Inter-American Development Bank, taking for granted that changes have to be made in our institutional framework to enable us to fulfill the main objective of ADELA; that is, investing in equity capital."

¹ NOTE.—Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY is working jointly with Senator JAVITS in this effort in the bipartisan tradition of U.S. foreign policy (represented also by Dr. John E. Rielly of his staff) and continues to be actively engaged in it.

"Whatever formula is ultimately adopted, I believe that the Bank's current activities, which are confined to granting loans, directly or indirectly, to private enterprises operating in Latin America, can be expanded and facilitated through association with the type of operations that can be undertaken by means of a mechanism such as the one proposed.

"FELIPE HERRERA."

Assistant Secretary General William Sanders (communication dated Oct. 29, 1963) in the absence of Secretary General Jose Mora:

"In the absence of the Secretary General I should like to acknowledge the communication recently received concerning the date for the ADELA meeting in Paris. It is the intention of the Secretary General, as communicated to you earlier, to attend that meeting.

"I believe it would be appropriate for us at this time to indicate to you the importance that we attach to this particular initiative. We agree that one of the most effective means for strengthening the private sector in Latin America is to obtain assistance from the private sector in countries outside the region such as United States, Western Europe, Canada, and Japan.

"It has been a privilege for the Secretariat to be associated in the discussions and preparatory work which have taken place. It is our hope and intention to continue to collaborate in this important new venture and to provide all the assistance possible.

"WILLIAM SANDERS."

Also, the Chairman and ADELA have been assured of the interest and personal cooperation of the Secretary General of the OECD, Dr. Thorvald Kristensen.

Mr. JAVITS. With respect to the recommendations on East-West trade, I wish to make reference to the recommendation on the same subject which was adopted at the eighth plenary session in 1962. Since no report was made by the North Atlantic Council on that recommendation of 1962, the point of this year's recommendation is that action should be taken on last year's. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the text of last year's recommendation on East-West trade.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION I

The Conference of NATO Parliamentarians recognizing that some member countries as well as uncommitted countries may derive substantial benefits from trade with the Soviet bloc conducted along the lines of normal commercial practices; recognizing further that it may be contrary to the interests of free world economic strength and development to ask such countries to forgo any or all of the benefits derived from such trade; recommends:

(1) That the North Atlantic Council review existing arrangements for the coordination of the policies of the member countries of the Alliance on East-West Trade and on the Soviet economic aid and trade offensive, in order to determine the adequacy of their policies to meet the objectives of NATO.

(2) That member governments should seek uniformity in respect of items listed as strategic materials to be embargoed in East-West trade and that provisions should be made for an agency to determine exceptions for member governments which believe that they must nonetheless carry on such trade.

(3) That member governments should consult together in the NATO Council to re-

view their policies on and to coordinate action within the framework of NATO with regard to East-West trade in nonstrategic goods and to determine what steps should be taken to insure that member countries are not vitally dependent on their trade with the Communist countries.

(4) That member governments should consult together in the NATO Council to develop an administrative means by which to coordinate their policies and programs to deal with economic warfare by the Communist countries; to provide compensation, where this may be required, in matters of East-West economic warfare; to pursue coordinated policies toward developing countries in the light of economic warfare; and to make specific recommendations to member countries on specific commodities and articles involved in economic warfare.

(5) That member countries are urged to avoid allowing excessive dependence on imports of oil from the Communist countries and toward that end should report to the NATO Council what they consider a safe maximum percentage of their requirements to be drawn from the Communist countries. Member countries are also urged to diversify sources of supply; to cooperate in the maintenance of reserve tanker tonnage in excess of day-to-day requirements; to seek safeguards from possible future interruption in supply by aiming at greater self-sufficiency and the maintenance of stockpiles of not less than 90 days of civilian requirements; to improve the techniques of energy forecasting; and to deploy the necessary scientific and technical effort to enable them to avail themselves of the benefits of nuclear power as soon as practicable.

(6) That member governments should be invited to reexamine their systems of taxation and their regulations in the energy field with a view of keeping the cost of energy low and affording a free choice to the consumer.

Mr. JAVITS. In the context of reevaluation of the political and economic impact of trade with the Soviet bloc—a reevaluation which is now proceeding at governmental and private levels in the United States and among most of the NATO allies—the ordered approach advocated by the 1962 recommendation takes on added significance. Furthermore, the rough draft on a possible Trade Practices Code in East-West trade contained in the report submitted to the Economic Committee this year deserves careful study.

With respect to the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America, I very much hope that before the end of this session I shall be able to make a further report to the Senate on the actions taken to implement this important initiative. Undoubtedly, with the difficult situation in certain parts of Latin America, our interest in successfully enlisting our NATO partners and Japan in a program to strengthen the private enterprise and investment sector in Latin America takes on great urgency.

My inability to be present during the concluding 3 days of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference of necessity limits the scope of my report on the plenary session. However, I am convinced from the proceedings I attended over the first 2 days of the plenary session and subsequent reports that the Conference is taking on a growingly important role in the destinies of the great NATO Alliance. It is most encouraging that in speaking from own national perspectives—both in

committee and plenary sessions—the NATO Parliamentarians maintain a profound awareness of the need for a unified Alliance and for the measures necessary to maintain such unity. I ask for unanimous consent that all recommendations adopted by the Ninth Plenary Session of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the recommendations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE NATO PARLIAMENTARIANS' CONFERENCE

STANDING COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

Whereas the Conference considers that it must be regarded as a matter of great importance for its activities that it is informed in good time before the next meeting about the results of the recommendations adopted by it; is of the opinion that it is also of importance to learn whether those recommendations have been passed on to the relevant authorities with or without comment or additions—and in the former case also to be informed of the contents thereof; therefore it recommends:

That this information should be supplied to the Rapporteurs of its Committees within 8 months of the end of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, having noted the report of the Special Committee of the Conference charged with the study of its institutionalization; expresses its appreciation of the work done by that committee in preparing its report; having also noted the recommendation of the Political Committee that the Conference holds two sessions annually, preferably one in North America and one in Europe; recommends:

The members of this Conference to draw the attention of the competent authorities to this recommendation and to report back to next year's Conference with a view to its implementation in 1966; decides that the staff of the International Secretariat shall be increased so as to be able to provide more effective assistance to Committee Rapporteurs; recommends:

That the budget for 1965 be increased to permit the implementation of this decision and recommendation.

CULTURAL AND INFORMATION COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The conference, realizing that an ever-increasing number of students from the developing countries are getting their education at schools and universities in the Western World; realizing also the importance of giving these students a real understanding not only of the political system in our part of the world and the motives for political and military cooperation between the NATO countries, but also of the basic values of our Western civilization which this cooperation ultimately tends to protect; considering also the Communist propaganda efforts directed particularly toward this group; urges the member states as well as responsible voluntary organizations concerned with the future of our Western civilization, to be explicitly aware of their responsibility for bringing students from the developing countries in contact with Western life and thought, especially with the idea of human responsibility and fellowship underlying our whole cultural tradition.

Guided by the same considerations, receives with pleasure the proposal of the Federal German authorities and the West Berlin Senate to hold conferences periodically in West Berlin to be attended by students, especially from the Afro-Asian countries, and to set up a center for collating and diffusing

objective information about the free world as compared with Eastern Europe; decides to refer for study to the NATO Cultural Affairs and Information Committee action designed to promote this initiative.

Recommendation II

The Conference recognizes that one of NATO's essential tasks is to disseminate information on the Atlantic Alliance and its objects; having read and discussed the very detailed reports of the Director of the Information Service, is convinced that the funds at present allocated to the Information Service are too small to allow it to fulfill the increasing need to spread information on the subject of NATO.

Bearing in mind, however, the high aims and important tasks of the Atlantic community, every available means should be employed, without prejudice to the information activities carried out in the various member countries, to insure that the political and military endeavors of NATO are brought before the public as far as possible by the Information Service of NATO itself, recommends:

That the budget of the Information Service be increased, partly to enable it to provide more information and partly because there has been a considerable rise in the operational costs during the past year. In view of the very limited budget of the Information Service, the committee would regard as reasonable an increase of 50 percent.

Recommendation III

The NATO Council is invited to encourage the project for an International Youth Festival prepared by the Association Diffusion Culturelle Atlantique under the auspices of the Atlantic Treaty Association.

POLITICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference notes the report of the Special Subcommittee and agrees that for the present the Conference can best serve to promote Atlantic unity if it is given the means to become a more effective link between NATO and the national parliaments involved, and therefore recommends, following the suggestions of the Special Subcommittee:

(1) That Committee Chairmen should, unless already members of the Standing Committee, become members of the Standing Committee in an advisory capacity.

(2) That the Conference shall meet twice a year: once in the autumn as at present, and once at the time of Committee meetings in the spring. The meetings of the Conference shall take place preferably alternately in Europe and North America, as from January 1, 1965.

(3) That a Rapporteur General be appointed to keep the Conference and all Committees of the Conference continually informed of the work in progress and to prepare an annual summary and report of the work of the Conference and of all the problems concerning NATO itself, and that such summary or report should contain a study of NATO policy in the light of the resources available to the alliance.

(4) That the Executive Secretary be empowered to recruit two additional assistants and two additional secretaries, and any other ancillary staff which may be needed to assist in carrying out the above reforms.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that no problem before the NATO alliance has proven more difficult than that of devising a unified NATO defense strategy, including a system of common control of nuclear weapons; declaring its belief that any solution to the problem of a unified strategy is rooted in the fact that responsibility is inseparable from power; recommends:

(1) That there be developed within NATO under the NATO Council a unified strategic

planning system aimed at the development of a full strategic consensus among the members of the Alliance in order to establish an effective basis for discussions regarding the use of both nuclear and nonnuclear forces.

(2) That to this end NATO governments undertake consultations toward the elevation of the NATO Council into a high level allied forum for unified strategic planning, the membership of such a revised NATO Council to be drawn from the highest levels of government.

(3) That such a revised NATO Council should engage in worldwide strategic planning in the broadest sense: political as well as military planning on questions affecting war and peace.

Recommendation III

The Conference, considering the question of devolving control of nuclear weapons is primarily political, and considering this question bears on the problem of developing a global defensive strategy; recommends:

That proposals for the multilateralization of the control and use of nuclear weapons be debated next year by the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference and hopes that in the meantime they will be subjected to parliamentary debate in member countries.

Recommendation IV

Considering the recent incidents on the highway linking Berlin to the free world, the Political Committee recommends:

That the attention of the NATO governments be once more drawn to the need for maintaining in their entirety the fundamental rights and obligations of the powers responsible for the international agreement on the status of Berlin.

ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting the report on the work of the Atlantic Community Development Group for Latin America (ADELA), as carried out under the NATO Parliamentarians Working Party in implementation of Economic Committee Recommendation III, approved by the Eighth Plenary Session, November 16, 1962; approving of the actions recorded in the aforementioned report; expressing appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the Secretary General of the OECD, the President of the IADB, the Secretary General of the OAS, the members of the NATO Parliamentarians Economic Committee and Working Party, and the personnel of ADELA, and for the cooperation of Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who acted with Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, as U.S. cosponsor of the ADELA program, and of other officials, both public and private, in member nations of the OECD and Latin America; declaring that the cooperative efforts to prepare an action program to meet the economic, social, and educational requirements for Latin American progress in freedom are expected to continue with the support and assistance of the OECD, IADB, and OAS; recommends:

1. That the Working Party be authorized to continue its efforts for 6 months only with respect to the ADELA project; and

2. The Working Party be authorized to invite the OECD, IADB, and OAS to take over its responsibilities as soon as possible; and

3. Upon consummation of steps 1 and 2, the Working Party to submit its closing report concerning completion of its mission to the President of the Conference.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that its recommendation No. 1 adopted by the Plenary Session of the Eighth Annual Conference in 1962 on the subject of trade with the Soviet bloc has not been adequately implemented, and recognizing further that developments since the Eighth Conference make it even more essential in the interests of free

world economic strength to harmonize if possible the trade policies of the member countries with respect to the Soviet bloc, including such policies as credit terms, patents and copyrights, status of traders, arbitration of disputes and trade practices, recommends:

That member governments and the North Atlantic Council be called upon to implement recommendation No. 1 on East-West Trade adopted at the 8th Annual Conference and to advise the Conference as to such implementation.

Recommendation III

The Conference, recognizing the need to strengthen the economies of the developing and developed free world countries by providing opportunities for trade and recognizing that nontariff barriers to trade continue to inhibit trade, and recognizing that important negotiations to reduce barriers to trade and to expand trade will take place in 1964, recommends:

That nontariff barriers to trade be considered especially by the member countries and the North Atlantic Council with a view to reducing the burden of such nontariff barriers upon trade and that such nontariff barriers be a prime object of trade and tariff negotiations to be undertaken among the members of the GATT at Geneva in 1964 and of the United Nations Trade and Development Conference in that year.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, while welcoming the development in international techniques designed to deal with temporary monetary imbalances, states its conviction that the problem of the balance of payments is of the highest importance to the prosperity of the free world and especially the living standards of the people of the undeveloped countries and further, that the failure to provide adequate international liquidity impairs the defense effort of the nations of NATO, urges the NATO Council to give further consideration to its recommendation VI adopted by the plenary session of the Eighth Annual Conference; calls upon the member governments to lend every support to the active consideration of this problem by the International Monetary Fund and the Paris Club in their impending study, and by other international agencies and institutions, and for concrete recommendations on how best to deal with the problem of international liquidity and imbalances in international payments in the interests of freedom and free world economic prosperity.

Recommendation V

The Conference, recognizing the success of the Conference in the ADELA project, is encouraged in seeking a similar initiative in the NATO area and, therefore, calls for the designation by the Chairman, subject to the approval of the President of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, of a working party to be appointed by leaders of the respective delegation acting in an official capacity, to include Greece, Turkey, Portugal, Iceland, United Kingdom, United States, Germany, the Netherlands, and Canada, to study and make recommendations of action which should be taken to accelerate the development of the less developed countries within the NATO Alliance itself.

MILITARY COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference considers that the control of nuclear weapons is a political problem; is of the opinion that, from a military point of view, the coordination and modernization of existing nuclear resources is as important as a numerical increase in such resources; considers that the Alliance should concentrate its efforts on evolving a system of joint political control over the existing

nuclear weapons within the Alliance; therefore it welcomes the decisions taken at Ottawa; Recommends:

That these proposals be further developed to enable all member nations to have a real participation in the full strategy of the Alliance, covering both nuclear and conventional forces; urges that the nuclear resources at the disposal of Saceur be increased by the assignment of existing resources, increased coordination at operational level, and the exchange of information.

Recommendation II

The Conference, recognizing that research, development, and production of new weapons and equipment are becoming increasingly expensive, so that in the future individual countries will be unable to bear the cost alone; recognizing that for individual countries to undertake research and development of new weapons results in a waste of time and manpower; believing that only close cooperation by the NATO members in this field can prevent the financial burden of the defense efforts becoming too heavy; believing that failure to cooperate will result in an insufficiently defended NATO territory; believing that cooperation can facilitate acceleration of the necessary standardization in many fields, including that of logistics; recognizing that certain progress has been made in joint development and production, e.g., Starfighter, Hawk, Sidewinder, Transall, and Breguet Atlantic, and that new projects are being studied; recommends:

That the alliance take all possible steps to increase still further coordination of research, development, and production within the framework of NATO, and to organize an integrated logistics system.

Recommendation III

The Conference, recalling the fifth recommendation of the Eighth Conference's Military Committee on the subject of civil defense; recognizing that progress has been made in the direction indicated by the recommendation aforementioned; noting that, nevertheless, civil emergency planning is still lagging behind the military effort within the alliance; considering that the vital importance of a civil emergency planning scheme, which is properly coordinated with the military defense system, should be stressed again; recommends:

That civil emergency planning as conceived, stimulated and/or coordinated by the Secretary General of NATO receive a sufficiently high degree of attention from the national authorities concerned so that the various psychological, financial, and organizational difficulties, which so far have caused civil emergency planning to lag behind military defense planning, will be speedily removed.

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Recommendation I

The Conference, noting that the recent advances in desalination of sea water are currently reaching an acceptable economic level; recognizing the immediate and urgent fresh water needs of several NATO countries, especially Turkey, for alimentary as well as for agricultural and industrial purposes; recommends:

That the members of NATO assist such countries in researching into, and developing suitable saline water conversion facilities, as a further contribution toward the efforts already being made in this direction by UNESCO, OECD, and other international organizations.

Recommendation II

The Conference, noting that the North Atlantic Council in 1962 released the report of its working group which unanimously agreed as to the feasibility and desirability of establishing an International Institute of

Science and Technology; reiterates its strong support for this proposal; regrets the failure to take effective action on this proposal; welcomes the interest demonstrated in the project by the United States and certain European countries, particularly the suggestion that a group of technical universities should undertake the initiative to establish an interdisciplinary center in earth sciences; noting that several countries have offered sites for the location of such an international institute; urges that the North Atlantic Council take up as a matter of urgency the proposal to establish that Institute; recommends:

That all the other NATO nations consider joining the group; and that NATO nations and agencies assist, insofar as practicable, the efforts already begun by this group.

Recommendation III

The conference, recognizing that the recent stringent curbs on potentially toxic drugs are tending to hamper the international interchange of pharmaceutical products and useful scientific data; recommends:

That the NATO countries cooperate with the World Health Organization in endeavoring to avoid adopting a "negative" attitude, and also that they insure the prompt interchange of new scientific data and beneficial pharmaceutical products without, however, ceasing to maintain strict control over their possible toxicity.

Recommendation IV

The Conference, aware that air and water pollution are constituting increasingly serious hazards to public health and hygiene; recognizing that certain NATO countries have made some technological progress toward dealing with such hazards; recommends:

That NATO cooperate with OECD and other international bodies to promote the interchange of technical information on measures taken to combat such pollution.

Recommendation V

The Conference, having noted the very interesting studies in oceanographic research being carried out under NATO sponsorship; strongly supports this research as an excellent example of international scientific cooperation both because of its fundamental scientific value and its relevance to NATO's interests; and strongly urges NATO to give continued and increasing support to this scientific work.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, for myself, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "\$64,221,212" and insert in lieu thereof "\$64,226,172."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to provide \$4,960 for the position of a Supervisory Director of Library Services for District

schools for the 6 months from December through June.

This position is presently filled and is paid for from private funds. However, these funds, which have been available since January 1962, have now been expended. The Board of Education considers this one of the wisest steps that could be taken in providing more adequate library facilities for the District of Columbia. So that the District may have the continued services of a Director of Library Services, I ask that these funds be made available.

The chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican member of the committee support the amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator's understanding, as he expressed it, is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, while I have the floor, I wish to take a moment to say again publicly what I have said privately, in the subcommittee, and in the full committee; that is, that the District of Columbia is very fortunate to have as the chairman of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations, the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I am sure every Senator realizes today what a tremendous effort the Senator from West Virginia has put into this work—work that does not yield any political dividends back home. He has performed faithful and loyal public service. I compliment him upon rendering outstanding service particularly for our institutions of education, health, and welfare. The Senator from West Virginia has helped to build these programs into much more effective and, I think, just and fair programs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I express appreciation also for the strong support he has given me in my work on the subcommittee and for the keen interest he has manifested many times in the various programs for which we are recommending appropriations today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD telegrams and messages I have received relating to the amendment just adopted.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Council sincerely request you use your influence to restore supervising director of District of Columbia public school libraries position in fiscal year 1964 budget. As you

know we are doing our best to correct situation by direct action but entire District school system urgently needs this position if we are going to make positive headway.

PAUL BEATLEY,
President, Capitol Hill Community Council.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We earnestly entreat you to present to the Senate an amendment to the District of Columbia budget (fiscal 1964) to restore and finance the position supervising director of District of Columbia public school library.

WAVE ELAINE CULVER,
Chairman, Action Committee for District of Columbia School Library.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce and support amendment to the District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervisory Director of School Libraries.

KENNETH G. ALEXANDER.

EVANSVILLE, IND.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce amendment to the District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervising Director of School Libraries.

CLYDE T. BAUGH.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Last-ditch appeal. Will you make amendment from floor to restore position Supervising Director, District of Columbia School Libraries to consolidate and continue beginning made in vital professional skills in book selection for school programs?

BARBARA NOLEN,
Cornwall, Conn.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you make amendment from floor to restore position Supervising Director, District of Columbia school libraries to 1964 budget as necessary beginning of much needed school library program.

HAZEL WILSON,
Chevy Chase, Md.

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 16, 1963.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request your assistance in restoring the position of Supervisory Director of the District of Columbia Public School Library to the District of Columbia appropriation for 1964. This position essential if the school library program so long neglected in the Capitol is to have any direction, coordination, or development.

RUTH FINE,
President, Executive Board, District of Columbia Library Association Chapter of the American Library Association.

CIX—1399

RALEIGH, N.C., November 17, 1963.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to initiate amendment to District of Columbia School budget bill which will reinstate appropriations for the Office of Director of School Library for District of Columbia schools.

CORA PAUL BOMAR,
Past President, American Association of School Librarians and Supervisor of School Library, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 18, 1963.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, representing 48,000 members, appeal to you to make every effort to have restored to the 1964 District of Columbia Appropriations bill, funds for the positions of Supervising Director of Library Science and librarians in the Amidon and Goding Elementary Schools.

Mrs. ARTHUR M. BLACKLOW,
President, District of Columbia Congress of Parents and Teachers, Grant School, 22d and G Streets NW.

JOLIET, ILL., November 15, 1963.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Request you introduce amendment to District of Columbia school budget bill restoring position of Supervisory Director of School Libraries.

MARGARET WHEELLOCK,
GRACE GISHWILL.

ACTION COMMITTEE FOR
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOL LIBRARIES
Washington, D.C., November 15, 1963.
The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: We have just learned that the Senate District Committee has deleted from the school budget for fiscal 1964 the request for the position of Supervising Director of School Libraries. The salary for this position has been provided for 2 years by the Junior League of Washington, and it will terminate this month.

We hope that, after you have reviewed the following list of accomplishments of the incumbent during this 2-year period, you will be persuaded to submit an amendment to the school budget bill, when it comes before the Senate, to restore the position of Supervising Director of School Libraries.

1. Screening of books from the mammoth Washington Post book drive early in 1962, and from the dead letter office project plus countless smaller contributions of books from the citizens of this area. Screening gifts of this type requires a high degree of professional skill.

2. Scores of parent volunteers were given a 6-week course in rudimentary library techniques by the supervising director.

3. Professional advice on selecting and buying books from private as well as appropriated funds is constantly given by the supervising director.

4. Supervision of the 13 temporary junior high school librarians, each serving two large schools, is a major responsibility of the supervising director.

5. Consultation service is given to senior high librarians, vocational high schools, school administrators, and the District Budget Office.

As instruments to accomplish the above tasks, and many more, the supervising director has written, produced and distributed the following documents:

A written statement of "Book Selection Policy."

A manual, "What To Do Until the Librarian Comes."

"Buying Guide for Elementary School Libraries," an extensive list of recommended books.

"Goals and Standards for D.C. School Libraries," a 5-year plan.

Very truly yours,

WAVE CULVER,
Chairman, Action Committee for District of Columbia School Libraries.

PROJECT APOLLO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Project Apollo: Giant Scientific Stride or \$20 Billion Moondoggle?" published in the Sunday magazine of the Toledo Blade of November 3, 1963. The article was written by Ray Bruner, Blade science editor.

We believe this article, which deals with the subject of placing a man on the moon, approaches the subject with an effectiveness that is astounding. It points out the dangers of failure, the impact upon the economy, and the number of persons who are employed on the project.

The article states that Houston, according to Lloyd's of London, may, by the year 2000, become the largest city in the world because of the centralization of the work in that community. The article is so effective that I suggest that it be read by Senators if they desire to have a capsule presentation of this important subject.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. This is a most important article. I hope that all Senators will not only read it but will send copies of the RECORD containing it to their constituencies.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MASSIVE SCIENTIFIC STRIDE OR \$20 BILLION MOONDOGGLE?

(By Ray Bruner)

Never in the history of human enterprise has anyone witnessed an undertaking comparable to the U.S. lunar project.

Its extent and growth are almost beyond comprehension. Even the idea of sending three men to the moon in Project Apollo, sometime in the current decade, seems slight by comparison.

In 1945, after the first atom bomb went off—a product of the huge Manhattan engineering project—President Harry S. Truman announced: "We have spent \$2 billion on the greatest scientific gamble in history." We, at the time, thought that was gigantic. But Project Apollo is estimated to cost at least \$20 billion. The price may be much larger than that. It might run to \$100 billion.

Some critics believe it may turn out to be a big moondoggle. There is no indication of a letup, however, until the moon blast occurs.

Only 6 years ago, when an expenditure of \$2 billion seemed huge, a majority of U.S. citizens were casually interested in the idea of a U.S. astronaut landing on the moon.

Even the word "astronaut" was an uncommon term. Many people believed the idea of a spaceship from earth landing on the moon was a little farfetched. To some scientists the idea of a rocket leaving the earth and even going into orbit was impossible.

The U.S. Navy, however, was working on its Vanguard satellites and the U.S. Army on its Redstone.

The Vanguards were widely advertised. They were to show the rest of the world that the United States by being first in space, was superior technologically to any other country. Work on the Redstone was going ahead with a minimum of fanfare.

Most of the work of the Army and Navy was hush-hush. We did not want the Russians in on our secrets. Only a few U.S. scientists were permitted to share them.

Then, in October 1957 the U.S.S.R. put Sputnik I into orbit. And the much-bellied Redstone launched Explorer I.

Sputnik I was the blastoff. The space race was on. We had to get ahead of the Russians. The moon was the major target.

Congress and the people of the United States had to be convinced of the urgency. T. Keith Glennan, president of Case Institute of Technology and former member of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, was named Administrator of the newly formed National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Mr. Glennan, a fabulous money raiser who has caused new buildings to materialize on the Case campus in Cleveland like toadstools on a humus pile, began working on Congress and the public. It was a multibillion-dollar proposition. Congress and the public were eager to listen.

The big selling points were advancement of science, good of mankind, and U.S. prestige. The idea of being awarded Government contracts for the development and manufacture of space hardware was also not unattractive to manufacturers, workers, and chambers of commerce.

Since then Congress and the public have listened favorably to almost an endless number of ideas for space ventures—communication, weather, and navigation satellites, orbiting solar, atmospheric, and astronomical observatories, Moon and Venus probes, and numerous others. Manned flight, however, was foremost. The imaginative brains of H. G. Wells, Jules Verne, and other science-fiction writers, as well as the Russians, must all be outdistanced by U.S. achievement in space enterprises.

With the orbiting of hardware in great variety, U.S. prestige started climbing. There were some setbacks, however. The United States slipped when the U.S.S.R. landed a lunik (unmanned) on the moon and used another lunik to circle the moon and photograph the side of it hidden from the earth.

But the space race was well underway. More billions came from Congress. The U.S.S.R., however, put the first man into space.

The United States soon followed with its man in suborbital trajectory. Then both nations with orbiting astronauts or cosmonauts. Astronaut Gordon Cooper made six orbits, but soon afterward a Russian man and a Russian woman went farther.

At intervals during the space race some scientists have argued that it would gain more for science if we concentrated on exploring the moon with unmanned ships and robots. At least, they contended, we should send a trained scientist if we were to have manned lunar flights.

For the time being at least, these suggestions seem to be secondary. In urging that men on the moon be made a national goal, President Kennedy said, 2 years ago, that "no single space project will be more excit-

ing, more impressive, or more important, and none so difficult, or expensive to accomplish."

Today, it's full speed ahead. Of course, the Russians might get there first. That could happen any day, so speed with a capital "S" is urgent.

Mr. Kennedy's pressure for a speedup has brought changes in NASA's original timetable for lunar exploration. The schedule now calls for manned circumnavigation of the moon only 5 years from now. This would be followed by a landing in 1970.

But these dates may be pushed ahead. At least some space scientists and engineers think so. Scientists at the Northrup Corp., Beverly Hills, Calif., an important space and weapons subcontractor, have visualized a "Cape Canaveral in the sky"—an orbital rendezvous base which would make possible a lunar landing in 1966 or 1967.

Although it is practically impossible to visualize the extent of preparations for manned flight to the moon, one estimate is that 20,000 industrial firms—prime contractors and subcontractors—will be involved by 1964 with about 500,000 employees.

Sir Charles P. Snow, British scientist and novelist recently estimated that "in 5 years 20 percent of all American scientists will devote their time to getting a man on the moon." The U.S. scientific community embraces an estimated 2.5 million scientists, engineers, and technologists.

NASA, organized in 1958, has spread its ramifications throughout the Nation. It has 79 departments and nearly 20,000 employees. This is in addition to the National Space Council, headed by Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson and set up to advise the President regarding space policies and activities.

Heart of the activity is the huge Manned Spacecraft Center, 22 miles south of Houston, Tex. The big springboard will be Cape Canaveral.

NASA's field operations include 11 centers. They are the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.; Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, Calif.; Flight Research Center, Edwards, Calif.; Lewis Research Center, Cleveland; Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.; Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; Wallops Station, Wallops, Va.; Langley Research Center, Langley Field, Va.; Manned Spacecraft Center, Houston, Tex.; Western Operations Center, Santa Monica, Calif., and the Pacific Launch Operations Center, Mugu, Calif. Not all these are directly involved in Project Apollo or manned flight—some not at all and some indirectly.

For fiscal 1964, NASA may receive as much as \$5.1 billion for its operations. This year it is spending \$1.8 billion. When confronted with reminders of such staggering figures, NASA officials reply that 95 percent of each year's budget is returned to local communities—industries and educational institutions.

During the current year it is spending \$80 million in the Nation's universities for training and research.

Many of the contracting companies, working on space vehicles and other hardware, have enormous research and development operations, depending almost entirely upon peacetime or military space programs.

During the current year the Federal Government is expected to enter into contract commitments for \$14.7 billion with private companies for research and development. Part of this is for space and part for military developments. This figure does not include the amounts private companies spend out of their own money.

Among the larger prime contractors are the General Dynamics Corp., New York; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.; the Boeing Co., Seattle; McDonnell Aircraft

Corp., St. Louis; and North American Aviation, Inc., Los Angeles.

Total facilities and manpower of these companies, plus subcontractors, are huge, involving thousands of scientists, engineers, and technologists for research, development, and testing; hundreds of buildings and thousands of acres of land.

Dwarfing any of these private facilities, however, will be complex 39 at Cape Canaveral and the Manned Spacecraft Center's facilities at Clear Lake, Tex., 22 miles south of Downtown Houston.

NASA's activities have made the "space crescent" along the Gulf of Mexico, in seven Southern States, one of the liveliest regions in the Nation. The "space crescent" comprises Florida, Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Georgia.

Complex 39, in Florida, the giant springboard for lunar flight, will be directed from the Project Apollo headquarters at the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Chiefly because of the lunar boom, Houston, according to Lloyd's of London, may become the largest city in the world by A.D. 2000. Its population passed the million mark in 1960, outranking Baltimore as the Nation's sixth largest city. Houston now calls itself "Space Center, U.S.A."

For months, on more than 1,600 acres at Clear Lake, bulldozers, construction machinery and construction workers have been bringing to reality the new Manned Spacecraft Center complex, costing an estimated \$150 million.

Into Houston, NASA alone has brought more than 3,000 employees. More than 75 aerospace companies have set up offices there. The Houston metropolitan area is being crowded with new industries preparing hardware for spaceflight.

When completed, the Spacecraft Center will have more than 15 major facilities. One of the largest will be the nine-story Project Management Building. Of comparable size will be the research and development offices and laboratories. The Spacecraft Research Building will contain special laboratories for spacecraft design, navigational equipment, model mockups of spacecraft and launch vehicles, as well as computer equipment.

Among the facilities will be a flight acceleration centrifuge, a one-armed rotating device for determining the effects of high gravity on men and equipment. The arm of the centrifuge will be about 50 feet long with a load capacity of 3,000 pounds.

Another large building will house the space environment simulation chamber. To test the durability of spacecraft as well as occupants, this facility will consist of two chambers—one 65 feet in diameter and 120 feet high and the other 35 feet in diameter and 43 feet high. The chambers will simulate the high vacuum of outer space and extremely high and low temperatures.

An integration Mission Control Center will house the operational facilities related to direct and indirect rendezvous flights of Projects Gemini and Apollo.

The facility will monitor such items as prelaunch checkouts of launch vehicles and spacecraft, perform engineering analyses, deal in problems likely to affect operations, monitor spacecraft telemetry, maintain voice and high and low speed data links with all of NASA's remote sites for tracking and guidance, keep track of space craft and astronauts in flight and provide play-by-play information to news media.

These are only a few examples to indicate the scope of the Manned Spacecraft Center.

Work on the center has created thousands of new jobs in the Houston area in addition to the 3,000 new employees of NASA. The NASA employees, drawing a total of \$20 million a year in pay, are expected to occupy \$20 million worth of housing. In Houston

NASA is now renting more than 300,000 square feet of office space in 13 different buildings.

On the eastern border of the Space Crescent, at Cape Canaveral, bulldozers, pile drivers and other machinery have been knocking down trees in one of the most productive orange groves in the country, leveling land and preparing more than 87,000 acres for fabulous new space flight facilities.

Most of the work is concentrated on Merritt Island, across the Banana River from the cape.

Merritt Island will be the future site of complex 39, the launching complex for the giant Saturn boosters that will blast the lunar astronauts into their great venture.

More than 5,000 construction workers are on the job. In another year there will be 9,000. To make way for the bulldozers, more than 400 homeowners are being displaced.

The Government has paid an estimated \$55 million for the land. The cost of the launching complex is expected to amount to a total of \$1.7 billion. Framework of some of the buildings has already been erected.

The launch facility will use an entirely new concept of sending vehicles into space. The boosters and spacecraft will be assembled in a large building 2 miles from the launching pad.

Complex 39 is situated far enough from any human habitation to minimize the roar of blast offs.

The assembly building on Merritt Island will be a giant among the world's great structures.

It will tower 525 feet—nearly the height of the Washington Monument. It will be almost as wide as it is tall. Its 130 million cubic feet will be greater than the volume of the Empire State Building in New York City.

Its massive doors, to receive the giant lunar vehicles for final assembling, mating, and testing, will be as high as a 45-story building. The assembled vehicles, rolled out by moving towers, will stand nearly the height of the Owens-Illinois Building in Toledo.

The assembly building of complex 39, designed by a New York group of architects, is to be constructed for NASA under supervision of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Not too long ago the site of complex 39 was a peaceful segment of Brevard County. The quiet was broken occasionally by an airplane flight to Patrick Air Force Base and the Atlantic missile range at the cape. The launching of the first rocket—a Matador—from the cape was an occasion for great excitement.

Then, with the dawn of the space age, excitement was intensified by Project Mercury, with the huge crowds of spectators clogging the roads with their cars.

Brevard County, between 1950 and 1960 became the fastest growing community, percentage-wise, in the Nation. The population increased to more than 111,000. During the decade, total property values increased from \$22.7 to \$435 million. Today the population is estimated at 153,000, with growth expected to continue to accelerate.

Another giant NASA facility in the space crescent is the \$50 million Michoud Ordnance Plant at New Orleans, where the Chrysler Corp. and the Boeing Co. will assemble the powerful Saturn-Apollo boosters. Michoud is one of the largest factories in the Nation. It has 1.8 million square feet of floorspace under one roof.

NASA spent \$10 million to get the plant in shape for its assembly role and another \$20 million for tooling and equipment. The 4,500 employees at Michoud have an annual payroll of more than \$40 million.

NASA has also allocated \$13.5 million for the purchase or lease of 141,850 acres of forest land in Hancock County, Miss., for construction of huge test stands for ground testing of the Saturns. In this area 3,000 construction workers are to be employed to erect the testing facility.

The Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., will direct the work at Michoud and Hancock County. The MSFC today is the largest of all NASA installations. It is the guiding point for the expenditure by NASA for research and development of rockets. During the last 12 years, Huntsville, a onetime cotton town, has increased in population from 16,000 to 85,000. The boom at Huntsville has taken up the slack in Alabama's steel, textile, lumber, and mining industries, which, for several years, had been going downhill.

While Cape Canaveral is the springboard into outer space, the Gulf of Mexico is the springboard to the cape. The two giant Saturns, launched in test flights in 1961 and last year, traveled by specially constructed barge through inland waters from Huntsville to the Mississippi River, the gulf, and around the Florida Peninsula to the cape.

More navigable waterways are now being dug, to transport future boosters. One waterway extends from Tulsa, Okla., along the Verdigris and Arkansas Rivers to the Mississippi. The barges will transport Saturn boosters from the Rocketdyne division of North American Aviation, Inc.

Meanwhile, many industrial plants, designed, constructed and staffed to meet the demands of the space age, are deep in activity—visualizing, researching, developing and testing an amazingly complex variety of materials ranging from the giant Saturns that will provide 6 million pounds or more of takeoff thrust to the tiniest transistors used for instrumentation.

At the American Potash & Chemical Co., Henderson, Nev., scores of steel drums loaded with salt compounds to energize rocket fuels stand under the desert sun to await shipment to rocket-engine manufacturers.

In Kansas and Missouri mines, zinc and lead are being brought from the earth to become components of electric batteries manufactured by the Eagle-Picher Co., Joplin, Mo., for use in Project Apollo's reentry into the earth's atmosphere.

At the Bell Aerosystems, N.Y., a huge tank made of plexiglass is being used to test Bell-developed Apollo expulsion bladders.

At Cox Instruments, Detroit, instruments are being assembled and tested to weigh liquid hydrogen and oxygen in Apollo's superficial gas storage systems.

At the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Minneapolis, Minn., scientists are trying out special instruments to be used in manual controls for Apollo spacecraft.

Special tools are being used at the Kaufman Glass Co., Wilmington, Del., to make precise measurements of the qualities of chemically stable glass to be used to protect the lunar astronauts in space modules that will take them to the moon and back.

At the Korry Co., Seattle, delicate wiring is being prepared for keyboards to be installed in Apollo's instrument panel.

Successful flight depends upon precise measurement of the flow of liquid propellants in the massive Saturn engines. The measurements will be made by a special flowmeter being developed at the Potter Aeronautical Corp., Union, N.J.

At Marion, Ohio, the Marion Power Shovel Co. has been awarded a \$12 million contract to produce the giant crawler trucks to carry the Saturns to and from the assembly building on Merritt Island.

Reynolds Metals, Louisville, Ky., is working with extremely fine aluminum powder to increase the burning rate of Apollo's escape rockets.

At Northrup Corp.'s Ventura division, El Paso, Tex., women have been stitching thousands of yards of multicolored nylon to lower the astronauts in their Apollo earth landing module back to terra firma.

These activities must be multiplied several thousand times before anyone begins to grasp the scope of the vast backup for the three astronauts.

The three astronauts will be launched by a three-stage Saturn. The first stage, a Saturn S-1C, with its 7.5-million-pound thrust, will have five F-1 engines. The Saturn-II second stage will develop a 1-million-pound thrust from five J-2 engines. And a single J-2 engine, in the Saturn I VB stage, will provide a 200,000-pound thrust to place the 80,000-pound spacecraft into trajectory, designed to carry it to an orbit around the moon.

The spacecraft, with a total length of 75 feet, will have 3 major elements. They are the command, service and lunar excursion modules.

The command module will carry all three men. It will also contain the guidance, communications and life-support systems.

The service modules will contain propulsion systems for mid-course maneuvers, plus a means of firing retrorockets to slow the spacecraft down as it approaches the moon, and goes into lunar orbit. The lunar excursion module, or bug, will land the astronauts on the moon.

If the three astronauts get to the moon ahead of the Russians, they will have the distinction of being the first human beings to see the moon's hidden surface.

Prime contractors for the Saturns are the Boeing Co. for the first stage; North American Aviation's Space and Information Systems Division, Downey, Calif., for the second, and the Douglas Aircraft Co., Santa Monica, Calif., for the third.

Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., Bethpage, N.Y., has the contract for the lunar excursion module, and North American for the command and service modules.

The command module, conical in shape, will be built like a fortress, to guard the three occupants and their instruments against any force foreseen and unforeseen, they may encounter on their round trip of more than a half million miles. It will weigh 5 tons.

The service module with its propulsion systems for midcourse maneuvers will weigh 21 tons.

To provide subsystems and assemblies for the two modules North American has enlisted the aid of more than a score of subcontractors in 21 States, including Ohio.

The Lewis Center in Cleveland and its facility in Plum Brook, near Sandusky, will have charge of the experimental work and testing of the lunar excursion module, which will cost approximately \$500 million. Other NASA centers will make similar contributions toward the development of the other modules.

The Martin Co.'s space systems division, Baltimore, has developed a model of the lunar landing module to simulate all phases of lunar landing missions. It will simulate "realistic motion," physical "docking" with a mother spacecraft in parking orbit around the moon.

The Martin flight simulator, constructed in full size, is connected with an electronic computer which automatically solves complex equations involved in motion. Solutions of the equations are reflected on a panel visible to the occupants.

In some of the tests, occupants have been confined within the simulated spacecraft for periods up to 7 days. The tests, simulating a flight to the moon, with emphasis on the critical final phases involved in landing and taking off from the lunar surface, are conducted in a sound-proofed, darkened room.

The simulator rests in a cradle that permits several degrees of motion on three axes—roll, pitch, and yaw.

The simulator also faces a wall in which a starfield is shown through a closed-circuit TV channel. A blinking light, first appearing at a distance and gradually moving closer, represents the orbiting spacecraft, with which the landing module must make contact in a rendezvous.

As the pilot inside the simulator swings his chair and looks through a porthole, the mother ship, represented by a conical shell on a crane, appears in view. Using reaction jet controls, the pilot docks the two craft.

The Martin Co., with the Black & Decker Co., as the subcontractor, is developing tools the astronauts may use to make emergency repairs on space vehicles. One tool is a "zero reaction" wrench which operates under weightless conditions. If the astronaut, weightless in space, tried to use an ordinary monkey wrench he himself would turn instead of the nut or bolt he was trying to tighten.

In developing a system to control the life sustaining environment inside a space ship, the AResearch Manufacturing Division, the Garrett Corp., at Los Angeles, is conducting numerous tests at its new space laboratory.

The tests will simulate conditions that will exist prior to launching, during the blast off, ascent, orbiting, and reentry of the earth's atmosphere. Equipment at the laboratory includes a complex data processing setup to determine conditions at more than 200 different combinations of temperature and pressure. The information will be recorded on magnetic tape and analyzed by an electronic computer.

While research and development for production of hardware for Project Apollo is vast and complicated enough, much more involved is research applied to humans.

We know a great deal about how an individual with a certain degree of mental and physical fitness can perform on the stable and solid earth. There is also elaborate data on the performance of the U.S. astronauts in Project Mercury. And we know how Lt. Col. Valery Bykovsky, the Russian cosmonaut, made out in his 81-orbit, 2-million-mile flight around the earth last July.

Traveling to the moon and back is another matter. The U.S. astronauts and Russian cosmonauts went into orbit at a speed of 18,000 miles an hour, but the Apollo astronauts will have to attain a speed of 25,000 miles an hour to leave the earth's gravitational field.

Scientists have a rather fair idea of the elements that may prove hazardous in the space between the earth and the moon. This information, however, is, by no means complete.

Life as we know it has adapted to the earth and its environment. Nothing is known how adaptable any form of life, including human, can be outside.

Consequently, one of the most critical jobs in the entire preparation for Project Apollo is that assigned to scientists in the department of biotechnology and human research, NASA office of advanced research and technology.

One important center under NASA direction for studying man's reactions to his unusual environment as he journeys to the moon is the Space Research Laboratory in the department of psychology at the University of Maryland.

One of the subjects of this study is 35-year-old Whilden P. Breen, Jr., who has volunteered to live inside an experimental chamber consisting of three soundproof rooms—one room 12 feet square and two small alcoves. He started his confinement last November.

His activities are programed. He has had to perform specific tasks according to instruction. Doors connecting the main room

and alcoves are fastened with electrical locks, controlled from the outside to assure his conformity to specific routines of performance.

One room contains a toilet, shower and washstand. He is assigned such tasks as obtaining clean clothes, taking a shower, using a sunlamp, sleeping, working, obtaining food and cigarettes. His tasks have ranged from those that are highly regimented in a temporarily determined environment, to a relaxed, slow-paced existence.

Initially Mr. Breen had no clock. He had no way of knowing the time of day.

In some instances he stayed awake more than 30 hours at a stretch, but made no comment that he was tired from lack of sleep.

After the 49th day of the experiment, he was given an electric clock, set at the correct time. After that, his periods of sleeping and wakefulness became more regular.

He was able to pursue two hobbies—painting in oils and writing a novel. His changes in mood were not unlike those of most individuals living under normal conditions, although somewhat more pronounced.

From latest reports he appeared to be in good physical and mental condition. He lost some weight at first, but after several weeks it became stabilized at 185 pounds.

Mr. Breen's unusual ordeal in confinement is in anticipation of the psychological and physical stresses that could decrease the efficiency of the lunar astronauts and fog their minds. The astronauts go through many additional trials such as effects of weightlessness.

What and how the astronauts will eat during their space trips is another important consideration, which the U.S. Army Quartermaster Corps is working on.

Army scientists, after a study, have suggested a breakfast of scrambled eggs, bacon and cereal, and that other meals should include one meat entree, one vegetable and a dessert at each meal.

Each food item would be precooked and freeze-dried. Each meal would be individually packaged, with the necessary water to rehydrate it. The food would be warmed to serving temperature within 10 to 15 minutes by a special electric heating device.

More critical, of course, is how to keep the astronauts alive inside their vehicles, as they transfer from one vehicle to another and as they land on the moon's surface. This also has been assigned to a number of investigators by the NASA director of biotechnology and human research.

United Aircraft Corp. scientists are working on the development of an Apollo space suit and a portable life-sustaining apparatus to be strapped to the astronaut's back.

In the use of this equipment, with human life at stake, in the moon's hostile environment, 240,000 miles from the earth, there must be no margin of error. The equipment must supply oxygen, under controlled temperatures, and humidity, free from contamination.

Inside a space vehicle carbon dioxide which the astronauts will exhale must be removed from the atmosphere and replaced by oxygen.

Canisters containing minerals to absorb carbon dioxide and release it into the vacuum of outer space have been successfully tested for 30 days of flight. Prototypes are now in the hands of the Air Force and NASA for evaluation.

The United Aircraft experimenters are also working on the idea of breaking down carbon dioxide into carbon and oxygen. In one experiment carbon dioxide is passed over molten salt, heated by electricity to 1,000° Fahrenheit. The carbon remains as a black crust on the electrodes while oxygen is released for rebreathing.

During 24 hours a man will exhale more than 2 pounds of carbon dioxide, and a half pound of carbon would be left in the separator.

The United Aircraft scientists are experimenting with the recovery of drinkable water by the distillation of urine, without contaminating the water with such toxic by-products as methane, carbon monoxide and ammonia.

Martin Co. scientists at Denver are cultivating a special blue-green algae, found in hot springs at Yellowstone National Park that would absorb water and carbon dioxide and release oxygen as the plants carry on their process of photosynthesis.

At the Illinois Institute of Technology Research Institute, Chicago, scientists are trying to devise an artificial photosynthetic process for the same purpose. They are working with isolated chloroplasts from spinach leaves.

The International Latex Corp., Dover, Del., is experimenting with pressure suits to protect the wearer against the moon's punishing temperature changes—220° above zero Fahrenheit to 240° below.

The astronaut would be protected by two garments, one worn over the other. The inner suit would be a pressure garment, made of nylon-reinforced Neoprene and it would have rubbery bellowslike folds at the joints, for ready mobility. The outer garment would consist of multiple layers of plastic film, each layer coated with aluminum, an effective heat radiator.

Another problem, related to the style of suit an up-to-date astronaut should wear is the problem of protecting a spacecraft and its crew inside from the hazards of outer space.

It is necessary to be sure that space crew is protected against several radiation sources—the sun, stars and the Van Allen radiation belts. These were not a significant hazard in the Project Mercury flights. The highest points in the Mercury orbits were well below the Van Allen belt. The earth's magnetic field also protected them against deadly ionized radiation from solar flares.

Before flight to the moon is attempted the extent and intensity of these hazards must be known. Lack of such knowledge could result in paying a great price in unnecessary shielding or risking injurious or lethal exposure.

Under investigation is the feasibility of chemical and biological means of counteracting any harmful radiation the astronauts may encounter.

There is also another danger—puncture of the space craft by meteorites. These outer space projectiles travel at a rate of about 25 miles a second. On the earth, we are protected from most of them because they vaporize and burn up as they enter the earth's atmosphere. In the vacuum of space there would be nothing to cushion their impact.

One of the industries working on this problem is the Martin Co. Under study is a spacecraft model with a double wall. The outer wall would act as a sort of bumper. Space between the walls would contain vinyl plastic bags about 4 feet square.

Each bag would be punctured to permit all the air they contained to escape into empty space. And, during flight, if even the tiniest meteorite were to penetrate the inner wall, air would escape into the bags and tend to reinflate them.

The bags would be equipped with electronic sensors, connected with signal lights inside the cabin. The signal could tell when and where a leak has occurred.

Because of the high vacuum outside, air from the interior might rush rapidly through even the smallest puncture. No scientist has yet been able to create such a high vacuum. Our atmosphere at sea level contains quintillions and quadrillions of air molecules per cubic inch. Space, how-

ever, contains only about 10 atoms in the same volume.

After all space hardware for Project Apollo is completed, and the astronauts are ready for the final countdown for the flight to the moon, the next question is: How do they get there?

If the moon were a stationary target on the side of a barn it would not be hard to hit. But the moon, with an average distance from the earth of 239,000 miles, is always on the move.

The moon and the earth may be considered, in some respects a double planet, although the earth is 7,900 miles in diameter, while the diameter of the moon is 2,160. Its distance is equal to about 10 earth orbits of a Mercury astronaut.

It makes one revolution around the earth in 27.3 days—a speed with respect to the earth's surface of about 800 miles an hour. Strictly speaking, the earth and the moon revolve around a common center of gravity which is situated several miles below the earth's surface.

At the same time the moon is traveling around the earth, the earth is rotating on its axis at the latitude of Cape Canaveral at a speed of about 600 miles an hour.

It would be a fairly simple thing to shoot the Apollo spacecraft on a beeline to the moon, if both stood still. At a speed of 25,000 miles an hour a rocket could hit the moon in less than 10 hours. Neither the earth nor the moon is sufficiently accommodating to let the moon be that much of a sitting duck for the NASA people.

Consequently the relative motions of the earth and the moon must be taken into consideration. The lunar orbit is not perfectly circular. It is, to a small extent, an ellipse. All this has to be taken into account. There is also the density of the earth's atmosphere to be considered, which will offer resistance to the space vehicle.

These and a great many more factors call for the assistance of electronic computers to work out the proper trajectory.

The most obvious approach would be to shoot to the moon directly from Cape Canaveral. But to land the astronauts on the lunar surface, the space vehicle has to be slowed down on the approach.

Direct flight would be the simplest way to go. But it would require an immense booster, larger than the Saturn cluster now being prepared. This would mean greater cost and more delay.

After some debate, NASA officials decided to shoot the astronauts into earth orbit, orbit around the moon, and then land two men from the lunar orbit.

At countdown the 3 astronauts will roost 350 feet above ground inside the spacecraft.

The first-stage booster will fire and the vehicle will lift off. As the first stage burns out it will drop away and the second stage will fire. This will place the men into the earth orbit at 18,000 miles an hour.

They may make a number of orbits before the third stage is fired. The third stage will place the men into a lunar trajectory at 25,000 miles an hour.

As it approaches the moon, the spacecraft will about-face and release a retrorocket to slow it down and place it in lunar orbit. It will then release two of the astronauts inside the lunar excursion module or bug. The third astronaut will remain in orbit.

The bug will fire a rocket moonward for a soft landing on the moon's surface.

After the two men fulfill their mission on the moon, they will blast off in the bug and rejoin their orbiting companion. After entering the command module, all three will head for home.

As they approach the earth they will turn the command module around, open the drogue parachute for deploy and reentry

into the earth's atmosphere. They will then open the main parachute and land.

The whole trip is expected to take about 3 days. The command module will contain all three astronauts except during the bug operation.

The service module, containing the propulsion system needed for getting the spacecraft in and out of lunar orbit, can also be used for aborting the spacecraft back to the earth in the event something goes wrong at blast off from the earth. There will be airlocks between the bug and the command module when the passageway between the two is opened and closed in transferring the two men from one to the other.

The bug most likely will have long spidery legs to help it land on the moon's surface. The surface may be covered with dust of unknown depth and fineness. The consistency of the dust has not been too well visualized. Some astronomers have suggested, because the moon has no atmosphere, or at least a very small amount, the dust may flow like water.

Others have suggested that it is solid. At least the astronauts, when they land, will not kick up a dust cloud.

Before the Project Apollo flight is attempted, the lunar surface is expected to be explored by spacecraft in NASA's Project Surveyor—an unmanned instrumented vehicle—to gain as much information regarding the lunar surface as possible.

All the vehicles landing on the moon and the astronauts' space suits and other equipment are expected to be thoroughly sterilized, because, if there is any form of life on the lunar surface it must not be contaminated by organisms brought from the earth. Any degree of contamination would nullify forever any scientific observations of life in outer space, insofar as the moon is concerned.

Landing will probably take place in the area of the Sea of Tranquility, a short distance from the lunar equator.

The astronauts will have about 2 minutes to decide whether to land or continue with the orbiting command module. When they land, the astronauts, dressed in their protective suits, will start walking. They will feel they are almost capable of flying under their own power because the pull of gravity on the moon is about one-sixth of that on the earth. Carrying a TV camera in communication with the earth, the astronauts will enable us to share some of their visual sensations—the barren mountains and craters, the dark sky, the brilliant stars and sunlight, and the green and blue earth with its white clouds.

They will gather samples of rock and other material and plant seismographic equipment able to register any tremors that occur on the moon and send the records back to earth. Only one will leave the bug at a time.

When they are ready to depart the bug's engine will be fired, pushing the bug at 5,500 miles an hour away from the moon. The planned return trip will take an estimated 60 hours.

The spacecraft will approach the earth at 25,000 miles an hour. As it enters the atmosphere, at an altitude of about 80 miles, the temperature of the heat shield will reach an estimated 5,000° Fahrenheit. The spacecraft pilot will be able to start gliding the vehicle from as far away as 5,000 miles from the earth's surface.

As with the Project Mercury astronauts, the Apollo crew will have a great abundance of facilities on the earth to help in guidance and a safe landing. The Apollo crew will have a much larger and more complex tracking network around the world than the Project Mercury astronauts. The Houston center will be in control.

Primary landing sites will be on land, but the command module is being designed to land safely on water as well.

Details of the lunar surface are expected to be obtained by unmanned vehicles in the Ranger and Surveyor projects. About 13 flights of these vehicles are planned for the next 2 years.

With the help of these vehicles, mapmakers hope to show objects on the moon as small as 4 or 6 feet in diameter. The landing area will have to be pinpointed to a diameter of about 150 feet.

Before Project Apollo is attempted, NASA expects to send a logistics vehicle to the moon to test the feasibility of a lunar landing not only by astronauts but also by such material as life-support and survival equipment and shelters to protect the crew.

Project Apollo will be preceded by Project Gemini, with two astronauts in a capsule blasted off from Canaveral by a giant Titan II. Although Titan II has made 16 successful launchings, there has been some question as to its safety because of vibrations it develops.

Thirty astronauts have been selected as possible candidates for the trip and are now in training for Project Gemini and Project Apollo. The 30 were selected from among more than 250 applicants.

The three astronauts who make the flight will have to know a great deal more about space flight than the Project Mercury astronauts. Navigation will present a complexity of unusual problems.

Mapping of the moon's surface in fine detail will be necessary before manned lunar flight is attempted. Because the two astronauts who land will need to find an area where the slope is 120° or less, the new lunar map, now being prepared by the Geological Survey, U.S. Department of Interior, will have to indicate this area.

Dust on the landing area must be no deeper than 20 inches. If the slope is deeper, the men may not be able to move around.

The Project Gemini is for the purpose of training astronauts to achieve rendezvous, and docking, or hooking together of separate spacecraft during orbital flights around the earth.

Some NASA officials have been apprehensive that the U.S.S.R. may launch two spacecraft to achieve docking and rendezvous before the U.S. Project Gemini is now more than a year behind schedule, and it is possible the Russians may already be ahead of us in this regard. The U.S.S.R. is now believed to have the capability of launching a space ship carrying more than one man. This has caused some observers to wonder whether the United States has not already lost the fabulously expensive moon race, in which rendezvous and docking maneuvers are so critical.

A year ago two Russian cosmonauts maneuvered their spacecraft within 3 miles of one another.

Although Project Gemini may be a year behind schedule, NASA officials believe the United States, with its massive nationwide effort, can gain ground.

Before his recent resignation as director of the NASA office of manned space flight in Washington, D. Brainerd Holmes insisted the United States can send three men to the moon 2 years ahead of schedule.

He admitted the Russians "may very well beat us." For one thing, he said, we do not know much of what the Russians are doing.

It would be "a bitter pill," he said, if the Russians get there first. The real tragedy, to his way of thinking, "would be for us not to go into the race as hard as we can and use the race to operate in space."

The space race, insofar as the United States is concerned, has aroused a growing number of critics.

Former President Eisenhower has called the moon project a "stunt" and a "cosmic boondoggle." One physicist has suggested that if a means could be found to weld together 20 billion silver dollars, edge to edge, an astronaut could walk to the moon.

One noted U.S. scientist, Dr. Barry Commoner of Washington University, St. Louis, said the lunar project will be a serious drain on the Nation's scientific talent, away from projects where there is a much more urgent need.

U.S. Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, said there are now 9,821 scientists working on various space projects as compared with 1,316 on mental disorders, cancer and heart disease at the National Institutes of Health. Senator WILLIAM FULLBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, has stated that urban renewal and education should have priority over landing a man on the moon.

In a recent issue of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Dr. Warren Weaver, noted mathematician and former president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, said \$30 billion spent on space by 1970 would build 10 medical schools costing \$200 million each, endow 200 small colleges with \$10 million apiece, finance the education of 50,000 scientists through graduate school, create three new Rockefeller Foundations worth \$500 million each, build and endow complete universities for 53 foreign countries, and give every teacher in the United States a 10-percent raise for 10 years.

Dr. Philip H. Abelson, editor of the journal, Science, and noted chemist, recently wrote in the journal that landing on the moon would be a notable event. Nevertheless when the excitement wears off, boredom is inevitable.

One of the leading foreign critics of the U.S. space effort, Sir Bernard Lovell, director of the Jodrell Bank Observatory in England, has reported that the Soviet Academy of Science is not so sure that getting a man to the moon would be worthwhile. Sir John Cockcroft, British Nobel Prize winner in nuclear physics, has stated he believed it more worth while to invest in "making a better go" of things on the earth before landing men on the moon.

Some scientists, such as Fred Hoyle, a leading British astrophysicist, has warned of the possibility of catastrophic failure of the lunar project. After all, NASA has failed so far in landing an unmanned Ranger on the moon to explore its surface.

Other scientists, in urging that we concentrate our lunar effort on landing instruments on the moon, insist that instruments could achieve a great variety of exploration at about 1 percent of the cost of manned lunar flight, which would add comparatively little to our knowledge of the moon and its structure.

Suggestions by scientists that NASA train at least one scientist to take part in the lunar landing have been largely ignored by the agency.

A number of leading biologists have expressed the fear that Project Apollo may be merely a stunt to stir up excitement and impress other nations. If it does turn out to be that sort of a venture, they are fearful of the consequences with regard to what they consider the most important subject of space exploration—the forms of life, if any, that may exist in outer space. Contamination of the moon with organisms from the earth would make that portion of space research a failure insofar as the moon is involved.

Space enthusiasts, on the other hand, believe lunar exploration will add a great deal to our store of scientific knowledge that will be of benefit to all mankind. Nevertheless, there is a question of whether the amount of information that must be obtained on

the earth before a lunar flight is attempted will far outweigh anything gained by Project Apollo for other purposes.

What, for example, will knowledge of the effect of weightlessness on an astronaut during a lunar flight, add to current knowledge of human biology to improve medical care or the prevention of illness?

Dr. Edward Teller, commonly known as the moon. This, he believes, would aid in favor of lunar flight as a means of establishing a large and independent colony on the Moon. This, he believes, would aid in national security. Also, he testified in a congressional hearing, a nuclear reactor should be developed on the moon eventually to provide power and extract water from the moon's rocks and soil.

Scientists are now doing research with such ideas in mind. At North American Aviation, Inc., scientists have visualized a dome-shaped factory for acquiring minerals and water from beneath the moon's surface. Volcanic rock on the moon, they estimate, contains 1 gallon of water per cubic foot. After the water is extracted, the rock residue could be used as cement for construction purposes.

The North American scientists have also visualized an underground life center with living quarters, a medical center, recreation areas, and shop facilities.

Whether the United States lunar boom turns out to be a triumph or a catastrophe remains to be seen.

PLANNING FOR TECHNOLOGICAL UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 5, 1963, the Christian Science Monitor did an unusual thing on its editorial page. It devoted its entire editorial columns to one subject: job displacement through automation. It agrees with the judgment that "automation is a more serious threat to employment than was the industrial revolution."

The seriousness is uniquely highlighted in one statistic: there are 40,000 displaced workers per week from automation. Jobs must be found for these in addition to all of the new workers coming on the labor market from other sources. There is a staggering human problem here. Some of that is detailed in the editorial development. Theoretically technology makes new jobs as fast as it destroys old ones. That assertion is not only in contention, but further the new jobs are not always or often for the people displaced.

It is not a new problem. Of the situation in the Cumberland mining country it is noted that "three generations of living on handouts resulted in a whipped and dispirited community."

The editorial is not without hope. It cites mainly the hope of education and rehabilitation, and pilot programs which show what this can do.

Mainly, however, the editorial stresses the need for hard thinking, planning, and doing something about it in these United States.

I share the concern and the urgency. I intend to have more to say in the development of the subject. For the moment, I wish to bring this editorial to the attention of Senators. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMATION AND THE DISINHERITED—TECHNOLOGY MAKES MORE JOBS, IT IS TRUE, BUT NOT ALWAYS, OR OFTEN, FOR THE PEOPLE WHO ARE DISPLACED

"There is general agreement that automation is a more serious threat to employment than was the industrial revolution." In this striking statement, Richard L. Worsnop, of Editorial Research Reports, speaks the views of some businessmen as well as of labor leaders and Government authorities.

John I. Snyder, Jr., board chairman of U.S. Industries, Inc., a company that makes automatic machinery, admits, "We're using sophisticated machines to destroy jobs." His company is financing a foundation, cosponsored with the International Association of Machinists, to study problems of technological displacement.

John F. Henning, Under Secretary of Labor, estimates that 2.2 million jobs a year are eliminated in the United States by increased output per man hour due largely to technological progress. This means that new jobs need to be found for 40,000 displaced workers a week besides new workers.

The classical contention has been that invention creates new jobs as it wipes out old ones. But as applied to automation, or cybernetics, Mr. Snyder declares this is a myth. And Mr. Worsnop sums up the evidence thus:

"Ideally, displaced workers should be the first to share in the benefits of automation. So far, just the opposite has been true. Workers who have managed to hold on to their jobs in automated factories find working conditions and fringe benefits improved. Many of those who have lost their jobs to machines are likely to remain unemployed, or employed only part time, for the remainder of their lives."

MINERS: FROM PAYROLLS TO DANGEROUS "DOG HOLES"

One of the regions where displacement of this sort has taken a most heavy toll is described by Homer Bigart in the New York Times. In the Cumberland Mountains of eastern Kentucky tens of thousands of idle miners, replaced by coal-cutting machines, face a winter of grinding poverty. "Three generations of living on handouts," he reports, has eroded their self-respect and "resulted in a whipped, dispirited community."

In one county even Government surplus foods are not available because the county has no funds to fetch and distribute them. Able-bodied men, barred from the relief rolls, leave their families so the women can qualify for aid to dependent children (ADC).

These, as described by A. H. Raskin in the Saturday Evening Post, are "the once-proud men whose high wages and industry-financed pensions made them the soot-smudged aristocrats of American labor only a dozen years ago." Today some of them "scratch out a perilous subsistence" in played-out pits or "dogholes" where the coal seam is too thin for effective mechanization.

All this takes place while Department of Commerce statistics show that the gross national product for the country at large has risen to an annual rate of more than \$588 billion and disposable personal income is at a new high of more than \$400 billion annually.

ARE AMERICANS LIVING IN TWO COMPARTMENTS?

Several months ago the traveling interviewer, Samuel Lubell, observed that while older workers in stable industries were doing well, many younger workers "have been virtually walled out . . . by seniority rights and high fringe benefits."

Does this mean that, unless steps are taken to prevent it, a situation described by Prof. Andrew Hacker of Cornell University is taking shape? To the American Political Science Association, September 6, Dr. Hacker said, "It may well be that two Americas are emerging, one a society protected by the corporate umbrella and the other a society whose members have failed to affiliate themselves with the dominant institutions."

If such a situation is to be avoided there will have to be some hard thinking, planning, and doing about it in the United States. There are remedies but they are not automatic. Congress and State legislatures have hardly caught up with the age of the typewriter, let alone the computer.

Some remedies are nonpolitical. For example, does all research have to be directed toward using mineral and other inorganic resources? Why not more research and development toward devising industries that can utilize relatively unskilled or semiskilled hands? Ingenuity has found use for once waste materials from bones and sawdust to cinders and bagasse; why not for surplus human resources? Industry already does vast amounts of training and retraining; but a company can afford this only where there is a prospect of use within its own organization.

Much of the need in an age of rising technology is for a spread of elementary education, then for more and better vocational education, and finally for retraining programs where an obsolete skill must be replaced by a current one.

HOPE IN EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION

This calls for more schools such as one in New Haven, Conn., described in the October Reader's Digest by Lester Velie—an elementary school that has made itself a 16-hour-a-day community center in a slum neighborhood and sparks an interest in learning among Negro families hitherto without hope.

It calls also for such initiative as has been displayed in Chicago, where the Cook County Welfare and Rehabilitation Service last year placed in jobs 12,000 persons formerly on the relief rolls. It did this by a basic literacy program and evening vocational or high school courses which welfare recipients were required to take. In addition, 5,000 relief clients were put on work projects for the city, county, or State.

The problem of idle human resources is complicated by the fact that in some States compensation is being paid to persons in fairly comfortable circumstances while in others the compensation payments have been exhausted by workers whose families are hungry and for whom the prospect of reemployment is remote if not nonexistent.

Among workers with displaced skills, such as notably the coal miners, one of two needs exists. Either new industry must be brought to them or they must be retrained and enabled to move where employment is assured. The latter course involves some kind of sustenance payments.

LABOR-INDUSTRY FUNDS ONLY PARTLY SUCCESSFUL

Automation, through its economies, does create new market demands and ultimately new jobs—but they are not generally for the same people, or even the sons and daughters of the same people, unless a great deal of human relations engineering is introduced into the process.

Efforts of unions and industries to cushion the effect of technological change by special funds for this purpose have been only partly successful. One of the first, in the pack-housing industry, produced only 8 retrained persons out of 431 laid off. The Pacific Maritime Association, in agreement with the longshoremen's union, has set up a fund by which profits from greater effi-

ciency stabilize weekly earnings and sweeten retirement pay.

Unquestionably, technological advancement can introduce new jobs as it obliterates old ones. Prof. Walter Buckingham, a labor mediator, says most of the jobs held by workers in the United States today "would not exist if it were not for technology."

Yet, to return to Mr. Snyder, this seller of automation believes that in time machines will do most of the work of humans. "People—living, breathing, feeling, and thinking people" he says, "somehow will have to learn to do nothing in a constructive way." Many of them already have found enriching uses for their leisure.

Will machines further shorten the work week and leave even the employed with time on their hands? Will a few be busier than ever correlating the functions of the machines? And will some unhappy thousands, even millions, find themselves left out of such an economy altogether? To avoid this last possibility, the President's Committee on Labor-Management Policy says, "Achievement of technological progress without sacrifice of human values requires a combination of private and government action consonant with the principles of a free society."

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7431) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at this point in the RECORD, a report by the Comptroller General of the United States, under date of August 8, 1963, relating to selected District of Columbia government employees who are licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
August 8, 1963.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
Chairman, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request of July 20, 1963, herewith for use by your subcommittee are the initial results of our limited tests of the attendance to official duties of selected District of Columbia government employees who are licensed to drive taxicabs in the District of Columbia. Our tests related to the 4-week period March 31 to April 27, 1963.

Our review of the records maintained by the Public Vehicles Bureau, Metropolitan Police Department, disclosed that 82 of 2,282 employees of the Departments of Sanitary Engineering and Highways and Traffic included in our tests were licensed hackers. Regulations of the District's Public Utilities Commission require that hackers maintain a daily record of trips (manifests) and that the manifests be kept on file at the residence of the driver and be available for inspection for a period of 1 year. With the assistance of officials of the Metropolitan Police Department, the 82 hackers were requested to submit their manifests covering the 4-week test period. Following is a table showing the responses to this request.

Response and number of employees

Furnished 1 or more manifests.....	47
Stated that they had not hacked for 9 months or more.....	13
Stated that they did not hack during the period involved.....	12
Stated that the manifests were lost or destroyed.....	6
Responded but did not furnish manifests.....	3
No response.....	1
Total.....	82

Our comparison of information on the manifests, submitted by the employees, with the time and leave records maintained by the District for these employees disclosed that only 11 employees submitted manifests which showed adequate time data and indicated no discrepancies. We noted discrepancies relating to the attendance to duty of 19 employees. In addition, some of the manifests submitted by 11 of these 19 employees and all the manifests submitted by the remaining 17 employees did not contain sufficient data on the time that trips were made to enable identification of possible discrepancies. District Public Utilities Commission regulations require that the manifests show the time each tour of duty begins and ends and the time of commencement of each trip during the tour.

A tabulation of the discrepancies disclosed by the comparison follows:

	Number of employees ¹
Hacked while in an official duty status....	14
Hacked while on sick leave—during work hours.....	4
Hacked on days for which sick leave was charged—after regular duty hours.....	2
Hacked on days for which sick leave was charged—time of trips not shown.....	4

¹ Several employees are included in more than one category.

The data was obtained from manifests submitted by the 47 employees; we did not attempt to verify whether these employees submitted a manifest for each day they actually hacked during the test period.

We noted, in addition to the above discrepancies and in addition to the failure of certain hackers to retain their manifests, that the personnel records for 19 of the 47 hackers who submitted manifests indicated that 5 employees had not obtained approval to engage in such part-time work, although such approval is required by District personnel regulations.

Enclosed is a listing showing details on responses of the 82 hackers to requests for submission of manifests and on our comparison of time and leave records with manifests of the 47 employees who did submit them.

Our tests indicate a serious lack of supervision over the employees involved. However, the information contained in this report has not been discussed with the employees involved nor have the results of our tests been brought to the attention of District officials. Accordingly, our findings should be considered tentative and subject to consideration of further information or explanations which may be forthcoming.

We believe that the information in this report should be promptly brought to the attention of District officials for further investigation so that, if our tentative findings are confirmed, timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies. It is our understanding that your subcommittee will advise District officials of the results of our tests.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

DETAILS PERTAINING TO TESTS OF ATTENDANCE TO OFFICIAL DUTIES OF SELECTED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO ARE LICENSED TO DRIVE TAXICABS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—4-WEEK PERIOD MARCH 31 TO APRIL 27, 1963

Employees who submitted manifests (47).
Employees whose manifests show discrepancies (19).

NATURE OF DISCREPANCY

Employee 1 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show employee on sick leave 8 hours on April 15. Manifest shows trips from 7:35 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty April 23. Manifest shows trips from 7:35 a.m. to 3:35 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty April 23. Manifest shows trips from 7:25 a.m. to 2:50 p.m. on this date.

Employee 2 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 2. Manifest shows trips from 7:15 to 10:45 on this date. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 to 12:07. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 8. Manifest shows trips from 3:25 p.m. to 4 p.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 16. Manifest shows trips from 11:30 to 3:55. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 18. Manifest shows trips from 7:20 to 11:15. However, the manifest contains conflicting time data.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 10:15 and from 1:30 to 9:40 on this date. The manifest contains conflicting time data; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether trips were in a.m. or p.m.

Employee 3:

Time records show regular duty between 11:25 p.m. on April 8 and 8:07 a.m. on April 9. Manifest shows trips between 12:55 a.m. and 2:55 a.m. on April 9.

Time records show regular duty between 5:51 a.m. and 1:34 p.m. on April 10. Manifest shows trips between 10 a.m. and 12:45 p.m. on this date.

Time records show regular duty between 3:13 p.m. and 12 midnight on April 13. Manifest shows trips between 9:07 p.m. and 12:20 on this date.

Time records show 8 hours of sick leave on April 24, 25, and 26. Manifest shows trips between 12:06 a.m. and 2:26 a.m. on April 26.

Employee 4 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records show 4 hours regular duty from 7:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. on April 1. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 a.m. to 10:40 a.m. on this date.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty on April 19. Manifest shows trips between 3 p.m. and 4 p.m. on this date.

Employee 5 (regular tour of duty 10 p.m. to 6 a.m.): Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 18 to 6 a.m. on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 5:35 a.m. to 6 a.m. on April 19.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 21 to 6 a.m. on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 2:30 a.m. to 4:45 a.m. on April 22.

Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 10 p.m. on April 22 to 6 a.m. on April 23. Manifest shows trips from 1 a.m. to 1:55 a.m. on April 23.

Employee 6: Time records show 8 hours regular duty from 7:22 a.m. to 4:49 p.m. on

April 24. Manifest shows trips from 3:17 p.m. to 4:39 p.m. on this date.

Employee 7 (regular tour of duty 6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.):

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:15 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 8:25 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records show 8 hours sick leave on April 8. Manifest shows trips from 3:15 to 8:50 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:21 a.m. to 2:26 p.m. on April 22. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 7:25 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate regular duty from 6:17 a.m. to 2:07 p.m. on April 25. Manifest shows trips from 2:10 to 8 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 8 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.): Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 24. Manifest indicates trips from 1:45 p.m. to 6:01 p.m. on this date.

Employee 9 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 17. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 8 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours sick leave on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 9:40 a.m. to 3:05 p.m. and from 9 p.m. through midnight on this date.

Time records indicate that the employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 10, 24, and 26. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 7 to 9:30; April 10, 7:30 to 8:45; April 24, 7:10 to 8:20; April 26, 7:35 to 10:10.

Employee 10 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate that employee was on 8 hours sick leave on April 26. Manifest shows trips from 7:45 to 2:30 on this date but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate that the employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 5, 9, 11, 12, 17, 18, 19, and 25. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 7 to 10:16; April 5, 7:05 to 10:45; April 9, 6:45 to 9:50; April 11, 7:50 to 11; April 12, 10 to 2:20; April 17, 6:55 to 8:55; April 18, 6:25 to 9:15; April 19, 7:50 to 2:51; April 25, 4:15 to 9:26.

Employee 11 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate that employee was on sick leave for 40 hours from April 1 through April 5. Manifests show 4 trips on April 2 beginning at 6:20 p.m. and 7 trips on April 4 with no indication of time.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty on April 15. Manifest shows 5 trips (p.m.) on this date; however, no times are indicated.

Employee 12 (regular tour of duty, 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.):

Time records indicate that employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 12, 16, 17, and 19. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 1, 6:30 to 10:50; April 2, 7:50 to 9:20; April 4, 7:35 to 11:25; April 5, 6:30 to 12:10; April 9, 7 to 11:45; April 12, 6:20 to 2:20; April 16, 6:35 to 11:05; April 17, 6:35 to 11; April 19, 6:40 to 12:45.

Time records indicate employee worked 6 hours overtime from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. on April 20. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 to 12:45 for this date but does not indicate a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate that employee was on 8 hours sick leave on April 26. Manifest shows trips from 3:15 p.m. through midnight on this date.

Employee 13: Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:56 a.m. to 1:50 p.m. on April 19. Manifest shows two trips from 8:30 a.m. to 8:45 a.m. on this date.

Employee 14 (regular tour of duty 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.): Time records indicate that employee worked 8 hours regular duty plus 2 hours overtime from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. on April 3. Manifest shows 4 trips apparently beginning at 4:30 p.m. on this date with no termination time shown.

Employee 15: Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:11 a.m. to 4:47 p.m. on April 3. Manifest shows trips from 8 a.m. to about 8:45 a.m. and from 2:35 p.m. to about 7:20 p.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:40 a.m. to 4:51 p.m. on April 5. Manifest shows trips from 2 a.m. to about 7:10 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours overtime from 7:15 a.m. to 4:58 p.m. on April 6. Manifest shows trips made from 7 to about 10:15 on this date but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:05 a.m. to 4:48 p.m. on April 10. Manifest shows trips from 6:45 a.m. to about 8 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 6:22 a.m. to 5:06 p.m. on April 12. Manifest shows trips from 10:30 a.m. to about 11:30 a.m. and from 3:15 p.m. to about 7:05 p.m. on this date.

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty, as follows: April 19, 7:30 a.m. to 4:51 p.m.; April 24, 12 midnight to 8:09 a.m.; April 26, 8:22 a.m. to 5:34 p.m.

Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 19, 12:35 to about 7; April 24, 11 to about 4:35; April 26, 5:20 to about 11:45.

Employee 16: Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty from 5:54 a.m. to 1:46 p.m. on April 16. Manifest shows trips made from 9:38 a.m. to 9:56 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:42 a.m. to 2:17 p.m. on April 19. Manifest shows trips from 7:53 to 11:55 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty from 5:50 a.m. to 2:13 p.m. on April 23. Manifest shows trips from 8:15 to 9:33 on this date with no indication whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 17 (regular tour of duty 7 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.): Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty plus 1 hour overtime from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on April 10 and 12. Manifests for these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 10, 3:35 to about 6:25; April 12, 4:20 to about 8:10.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty plus 1 hour overtime, from 3:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. on April 18. Manifest for this date shows trips from 3:35 to 8:15 but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Employee 18 (regular tour of duty, 4 p.m. to midnight):

Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 15. Manifest for this date shows trips from 9:30 to 12:25 and from 7:40 to 1 but does not indicate whether a.m. or p.m.; however, there is a discrepancy regardless of whether a.m. or p.m.

Time records indicate employee worked his regular tour of duty on April 18, 19, 20, and 22. Manifests for these dates show trips

made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 18, 8:15 to 1:13; April 19, 8:10 to about 12:55; April 20, 8:55 to 11:10; April 22, 7:30 to 12.

Employee 19 (regular tour of duty, 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.):

Time records indicate employee worked 8 hours regular duty on April 3. Manifest for this date shows trips from 8:40 a.m. to 10:03 a.m. on this date.

Time records indicate 8 hours regular duty on April 2, 16, 19, and 24. Manifests for

these dates show trips made but do not indicate whether a.m. or p.m., as follows: April 2, 7:06 to 11; April 16, 5:50 to 8:05; April 19, 7:01 to 11:58; April 24, 6:45 to 8:40.

Employees whose manifests do not show adequate time data (17):

	Date	Hours worked for District, per time and attendance records	Hours worked hacking, per manifests (a.m. or p.m. not indicated)		Date	Hours worked for District, per time and attendance records	Hours worked hacking, per manifests (a.m. or p.m. not indicated)	
Employee 20	Apr. 2	6 a.m. to 2:50 p.m.	10:30 to 2:55	Employee 29	Apr. 1	8:03 a.m. to 4:47 p.m.	11 to 12:30	
	Apr. 3	6:08 a.m. to 10:12 a.m.	8:10 to 9:40		Apr. 2	8:07 a.m. to 4:51 p.m.	6:10 to 10:10	
	Apr. 5	6:07 a.m. to 2:36 p.m.	8:15 to 7:45		Apr. 3	8:12 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.	5:15 to 11:15	
	Apr. 8	6:01 a.m. to 2:39 p.m.	8:15 to 3		Apr. 15	7:45 a.m. to 4:42 p.m.	9:30 to 10:10	
	Apr. 11	6:05 a.m. to 2:31 p.m.	6:50 to 10:05		Apr. 16	7:55 a.m. to 5:18 p.m.	6:10 to 9:35	
Employee 21	Apr. 19	7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	11:35 to 5:40		Apr. 17	7:51 a.m. to 4:31 p.m.	5:45 to 9:30	
	do.	do.	6:05 to 8:35		Apr. 18	6:28 a.m. to 3:01 p.m.	1:20 to 1:35	
Employee 22	Apr. 22	6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	2 to 3:31	Employee 30	Apr. 15	6:28 a.m. to 3 p.m.	6:31 to about 8:20	
	Apr. 23	do.	1:50 to 2:20		Apr. 22	6:29 a.m. to 3:04 p.m.	6 to 9:05	
	Apr. 24	6 a.m. to 10 a.m.	6:15 to 8:40	Employee 31	Apr. 5	7:12 a.m. to 4:32 p.m.	4:35 to 11:18	
	Apr. 25	6 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.	1:30 to 3:45		Apr. 8	7:19 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	4:22 to 6:22	
Employee 23	Apr. 3	9:15 a.m. to 6:05 p.m.	10:50 to 12:20		Apr. 10	7:15 a.m. to 4:33 p.m.	7:59 to 8:40	
	Apr. 5	9:26 a.m. to 6 p.m.	12:45 to 1		Apr. 12	7:21 a.m. to 4:32 p.m.	4:28 to 6:18	
	Apr. 10	9:24 a.m. to 6 p.m.	5:30 to 6:10		Apr. 15	7:14 a.m. to 4:31 p.m.	8:22 to about 8:35	
	Apr. 11	9:25 a.m. to 7:24 p.m.	12 to 1:20		Apr. 17	7:25 a.m. to 4:28 p.m.	4:30 to about 5:50	
	Apr. 24	9:20 a.m. to 7:17 p.m.	5:40 to 6:45		Apr. 20	7:16 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	8:40 to about 10:30	
Employee 24	Apr. 2	7:20 a.m. to 4 p.m.	4 to 6:30		Apr. 22	7:18 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.	7:05 to 10	
	Apr. 3	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:35 to 9:05		Apr. 24	7:26 a.m. to 4:33 p.m.	8:10 to 9:20	
	Apr. 4	7:23 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:50 to 10:23		Employee 32	Apr. 4	6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.	9:32 to 9:40
	Apr. 5	7:18 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:59 to 9:42		Apr. 22	6:30 a.m. to 3 p.m.	9:30 to about 10:40	
	Apr. 8	7:07 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:07 to 11:40		Apr. 3	7:24 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	4:20 to 6:20	
	Apr. 10	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:52 to 10:15		Apr. 4	7:27 a.m. to 4:08 p.m.	8:05 to 8:35	
	Apr. 12	7:20 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	1:30 to 7:42		Employee 33	Apr. 3	7:24 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	3:35 to 9
	Apr. 17	7:19 a.m. to 4 p.m.	6:13 to 1:04		Apr. 4	7:27 a.m. to 4:08 p.m.	3:25 to 7:45	
	Apr. 18	7:22 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:10 to 10:26				10:15 to 11:35	
	Apr. 19	7:18 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:20 to 9:45				12 to 12:20	
	Apr. 23	7:21 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:12 to 1:16				4:15 to 5:17	
	Apr. 26	7:24 a.m. to 4 p.m.	7:30 to 9:35				7:05 to 11:05	
Employee 25	Apr. 1	7:16 a.m. to 4:07 p.m.	7:25 to 12:25		Apr. 5	7:46 a.m. to 4 p.m.	9:15 to 12:05	
	Apr. 15	7:08 a.m. to 4:03 p.m.	10:10 to 12:50		Apr. 8	7:38 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:51 to 9:36	
			7:15 to 9:01		Apr. 15	7:38 a.m. to 4:02 p.m.	12:30 to 2:41	
			11:50 to 1:50		Apr. 18	7:12 a.m. to 4:04 p.m.	7:35 to 8:30	
	Apr. 24	7:11 a.m. to 4:05 p.m.	9:10 to 11:45					
Employee 26	Mar. 31	2:19 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	1:55 to 2:07					
	Apr. 7	2:20 p.m. to 11 p.m.	9:15 to about 1:10					
	Apr. 8	2:13 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	10 to 12:50					
	Apr. 13	2:07 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	9:05 to 12:35					
	Apr. 14	2:17 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	10 to 12:15					
	Apr. 20	2:14 p.m. to 11 p.m.	9:35 to about 12					
	Apr. 21	2:19 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:40 to 12:10					
	Apr. 22	2:09 p.m. to 11:02 p.m.	9:45 to 12:40					
	Apr. 27	2:11 p.m. to 11:01 p.m.	9:05 to 12:20					
Employee 27	Apr. 3	7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:50 to 12:18					
	Apr. 15	do.	2:05 to 2:20					
	Apr. 18	do.	12:20 to 2:30					
Employee 28	Apr. 4	7:17 a.m. to 4:05 a.m.	10:25 to about 11:01					
	Apr. 5	7:13 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	8:20 to 10:45					
	Apr. 11	7:20 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:30 to 11:10					
	Apr. 12	7:15 a.m. to 4:03 p.m.	8:05 to 10					
	Apr. 15	7:23 a.m. to 4:01 p.m.	7:20 to 8:50					
	Apr. 19	7:25 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8 to 10					
			11 to 11:10					
			1:15 to 1:55					
	Apr. 22	7:11 a.m. to 4 p.m.	8:05 to 10					

¹ Submitted 2 manifests on Apr. 19, 1963.

² Hacker indicated that he hacks between midnight and 8 a.m.

Employees whose manifests show adequate time data—no discrepancies indicated (11)—employees 37 through 47.

Employees who did not submit manifests (35); stated that they did not hack during 4-week test period (12)—employees 48 through 59.

Stated that they had not hacked for 9 months or more (13)—employees 60 through 72.

Stated that manifests were destroyed or lost (6)—employees 73 through 78.

Responded but did not furnish manifests (3)—employees 79 through 81.

No response (1)—employee 82.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 7431) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate re-

consider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. WALTERS in the chair) appointed Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 620, House bill 8747, and that it be made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8747) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. HAYS, Mr. ADAIR, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PROSPECTIVE DECLINES IN NET FARM INCOME

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries a story, based on farm outlook studies which have just been completed by the Department of Agriculture, forecasting a cumulative drop of \$1 billion in net farm income in 1963 and 1964.

Realized net farm income this year is expected to total \$12.2 billion, compared to \$12.6 billion in 1962. A decline of 5 percent in net farm income is foreseen in 1964, or about \$600 millions.

Much of the decline in total net farm income this year is due to declining livestock prices. The anticipated decline next year is almost entirely attributable to the prospect of a drop in wheat prices from \$2 per bushel to \$1.25 per bushel. This necessarily assumes that Congress will not enact a new wheat program before the 1964 crop goes to market.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary to describe to the Senate the economic effect of such a considerable reduction in net farm income. It is primary producer income. It is money that is used by farmers to buy farm equipment, to meet family living needs, to pay interest and retire loans, and to compensate lawyers, doctors, engineers, soil conservation contractors and others for their services.

The \$1 billion decline in net farm income, means a much more sizable decline in gross national product. It will have a substantial effect, not only in agriculture, but in our total economy.

The agricultural income outlook, which will be analyzed very completely this week at the annual Outlook Conference conducted by the Department of Agriculture, emphasizes the urgency of two types of action which are necessary to forestall the decline.

First, it is time to work out limitations on the importation of meat into the United States. Cattle prices have fallen seriously in the past few months. A part of that decline is a result of the fact that domestic cattle feeders put too many steers into feedlots last spring and early summer, and fed cattle marketings are running considerably ahead of the previous year. But a part of that drop is a result of 11 percent of our total beef supply coming into the country as imports—a far larger proportion than is justifiable either on the basis of historic import records or on a basis of providing reasonable protection to domestic producers.

I understand that the Department of Agriculture is moving to establish import quotas, or higher tariffs. It should be done just as quickly as possible.

The second action that needs to be taken is adoption of a new wheat program applicable to the 1964 crop. Unless new legislation is passed, the support price on wheat is scheduled to drop to \$1.25 per bushel next July 1. It will mean economic disaster in a score of our States where the economy is heavily dependent on wheat income. It will mean lesser but serious economic difficulty for the entire Nation.

There is now before the Congress several proposals for a wheat program for 1964, including a voluntary certificate

plan which I introduced on July 29. I am gratified to report that the voluntary certificate plan is being endorsed by farm groups throughout the Western States at annual meetings now in progress.

The Missouri Farmers Association, Kansas Wheat Growers, Washington Wheat Growers, Nebraska Wheat Growers and the Directors of the Oregon Wheat Growers Association have all recommended such a voluntary certificate program and others appear likely to follow.

If enacted, the voluntary wheat certificate plan would maintain wheat income near this year's levels and avert the serious decline in farm income now foreseen without increased costs to the Treasury.

There are other wheat proposals pending by the distinguished assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY, by Senator MUNDT, my senior colleague from South Dakota, by Congressman QUIE, by the American Farm Bureau, and by others. Comparative analyses of these various plans increase my conviction that the voluntary certificate plan will get the best results of any of them. But I do not want to argue the merits of the proposals at this time, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article from this morning's Washington Post, reporting on the anticipated billion dollar drop in farm income, to emphasize the necessity of early action on the cattle import and wheat price support problems.

I shall be content to let the Committees on Agriculture judge the merits of the various wheat proposals after hearings. The House Wheat Subcommittee is planning hearings in December. I expect to request the chairman of our Senate Committee on Agriculture to schedule consideration of the wheat problem at an early date.

A program, effective as to the 1964 wheat crop, is urgent and it must be enacted early in the next session of Congress if the billion dollar decline in farm income, and its serious consequences to the whole Nation, are to be averted.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM INCOME DROP OF \$1 BILLION SEEN

The Agriculture Department had some bad news for farmers yesterday that undoubtedly will hurt President Kennedy and other Democrats in the 1964 campaign.

Department economists estimated that net farm income will decline by nearly \$400 million this year and may go down by as much as another \$600 million next year.

This would mean a total reduction of \$1 billion in net farm income over a 2-year period and obviously would give Republicans a telling political issue in rural areas.

In the Midwest and the West farmers generally vote Republican, but in the South they usually support Democrats.

Net farm income was at its height in 1947 when it reached \$17.3 billion. During the Eisenhower administration the figure reached a low of little more than \$11 billion in 1957.

By 1960 the figure had climbed back almost to \$12 billion.

The 1963 estimate is now \$12.2 billion. A 5-percent reduction next year, which Department economists say is possible would place the figure at \$11.6 billion.

The farm income forecasts were made by the Department's Economic Research Service. The annual Agricultural Outlook Conference begins today.

The 1964 outlook issue of the Department's quarterly publication, Farm Income Situation, attributes the 1963 decline in net income "to production expenses rising faster than realized gross farm income."

Much of the 1964 income drop, the publication continued, will probably be the result of lower wheat prices.

Last May wheat farmers rejected in a referendum a program that would have guaranteed them high prices but would have sharply restricted their production. As a result, wheat prices may drop from their current level of \$2 a bushel to as low as \$1.25 a bushel next year. More than half of the Nation's farmers grow wheat.

The reduction in farm income this year will probably mean no decrease in income per farm, however, because of the continued decline in the number of farms.

Current estimates place the number of farms at 3.5 million, compared with the 3.7 million during the last farm census in 1959.

Per farm income was at a record high of \$3,414 last year and is expected to be about the same this year.

NUCLEAR KILOWATTS WITH SUBSIDIES VERSUS FOSSIL KILOWATTS WITHOUT SUBSIDIES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, during the past several years I have observed with interest and a growing concern the continuing efforts being made by the Atomic Energy Commission to bring about the development of a civilian nuclear power industry. I have no doubt that the development of such an industry is inevitable, but the methods and the thrust supplied by our Government without parity for other affected segments of the economy are reasons for an increasing degree of alarm.

I am a Senator representing the State with the largest bituminous coal production in the Nation. Thousands of our people are gainfully employed in the production and transportation of coal, and the economy of many towns and counties throughout West Virginia—as in parts of our neighboring States—are tied to the economic health of the industry.

Electric utilities provide by far the largest market for coal. In 1963, more than 200 million tons of coal from West Virginia and other States will be supplied to generate 67 percent of all the steam produced electricity being used this year in the Nation.

This is the growth market for coal. By 1980, consumption of electric power is expected to be 300,000 billion kilowatts. There is every reason to believe that under normal circumstances and conditions, where free competitive enterprise prevails, coal would continue to be the fuel that would generate a major portion of this vastly expanded power requirement.

But programs of the Atomic Energy Commission are distorting this picture. The Government has involved itself with subsidy grants to electric utilities build-

ing new commercial nuclear powerplants instead of so-called conventional fossil fuel electric generating facilities.

A variety of direct and indirect subsidies are being used in an effort to develop and build plants that can produce nuclear power competitive with that produced in coal- and oil-fired plants.

I make clear, Mr. President, that I am not referring to the purely experimental work on reactors which the AEC has conducted and is continuing to conduct as a part of the valid national research effort.

Objection is made to the AEC program of subsidizing the construction and operation of large, nonexperimental identical nuclear powerplants which will compete with coal-generated electricity in the marketplace. The development of new prototype reactors apparently has taken second status to the all-out effort by the AEC to bring into being a lusty and thriving nuclear power industry that will compete with coal and other fossil fuels. This is being done regardless of the cost to the taxpayers and the economic dislocation and unemployment in adversely affected regions of the country.

It is important that the Congress should begin at once an especially careful look at the civilian nuclear power program.

According to Dr. Glenn Seaborg, AEC Chairman, the objective of the program no longer seems to be to bring about the development of nuclear powerplants which private utilities could then build if such plants were economic and competitive. The fact is that Dr. Seaborg declared in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy earlier this year that the objective is:

The demonstration of competitiveness of nuclear powerplants by assuring the construction of such plants rather than the development of such plants as did our 10-year program.

Yes, Dr. Seaborg said "assuring the construction," and I emphasize the words "assuring" and "construction," of such plants "rather than their development." The AEC—or at least its Chairman—is not content with the Government helping to develop nuclear powerplants. It—or at least its Chairman—is determined that Government shall help construct them, if necessary.

That, Mr. President, is Government going too far—and too fast—to build one industry and tear down other long-established ones.

There can be no doubt that the AEC is serious in its intention to see that these large nonexperimental plants are built. It proposes, according to Dr. Seaborg, to "stimulate and support" the utility industry in the building of the plants. The "stimulation and support" of the utility industry will take the form of subsidies of one type or another—and from the Federal Treasury. If the present subsidy program proves to be inadequate, Dr. Seaborg has stated that "more attractive forms of incentives will be offered."

In other words, Mr. President, the implication is that there is no ceiling on the subsidies proposed and others to be proposed—unless Congress refuses to be stampeded, and I hope this will be the reaction.

Dr. Seaborg and others who are advocating this program of huge Government subsidies are quick to assure the coal industry that it has nothing to worry about. So much electricity will be consumed by the turn of the century, they predict—and it is only hypothesia—that the Nation will be hard-pressed to produce enough coal, oil and gas to generate the power likely to be required by the year 2000.

Although I appreciate Dr. Seaborg's concern for the welfare of the coal industry, I am more concerned about what is going to happen next year—and in the succeeding 5 to 10 years—than I am about what will be the situation at the turn of the century.

If Dr. Seaborg and associates prevail and the 12 additional large nonexperimental nuclear powerplants proposed by the AEC should be built, they would displace, during their lifetime, the equivalent of 280 million tons of coal. And these plants would be in full operation long before the turn of the century. Is there assurance that they will be constructed only in areas where coal is not available or available only at extremely high cost? There is none.

Also, one form of the subsidies currently being used to stimulate and support the construction of nuclear plants will have a profound effect on future coal markets well in advance of the new century. I refer to the Government financing of nuclear fuel for these utilities.

The AEC and other experts predict that by 1980 as much as 20 percent of the Nation's power needs will originate in nuclear generating plants.

Other authorities, including Dr. Theodore Baumeister, Stevens professor of mechanical engineering at Columbia University, have stated that if Government financing is discontinued and private utilities are then to go into the commercial money market to obtain funds for owning, processing, and reprocessing their own fuel, the rate of growth of nuclear power would be slowed dramatically and the nuclear power share of the market would be no more than 2 percent.

By 1980, generation of 20 percent of the electricity market would require the equivalent of 192 million tons of coal. Two percent would amount to only 19 million tons of coal equivalent. Thus, this one subsidy alone, in the opinion of qualified experts, is threatening markets for 173 million tons of coal by the year 1980—not by the turn of the century.

I believe the coal producing companies, the coal mine machinery manufacturers and machinery service establishments, the men who mine coal and service the industry's equipment, and the railroads which transport coal to the markets and the export docks are worried. They have a right to be concerned and so do the hundreds of thousands of families depending on coal and coal-carrying railroads for livelihood. I join them in being disturbed by the scope and the direction of the civilian nuclear power program being directed and financed by the Government in substantial part.

The coal industry and allied industries for producing and transporting this fuel have invested more than \$32 billion in plants and facilities and provide

gainful employment for more than 2.5 million Americans.

The AEC program of subsidies for building large plants could ultimately have the effect of wiping out this great American industry. There is no assurance that this will not happen, and if it should happen it certainly would be detrimental to the national economy and security.

There should not be a continuation or expansion of the subsidy portion of the civilian nuclear power program. The AEC—the Commission itself—has made it clear that without Government subsidies, both for construction and operation, these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity, even in the so-called high fuel cost areas. Government subsidies make the difference.

The Government already has spent \$1.25 billion and, according to testimony of AEC officials, it would spend another \$1.5 billion, not only in developing the technology but also in helping to finance—through subsidies—actual large-scale nonexperimental plants to produce nuclear power economically.

Is this program, on such a vast scale, a necessity? Can the continued subsidization of nonexperimental nuclear powerplants be justified?

These are questions which, I believe, must be carefully reviewed and realistically and accurately answered.

I have not seen any persuasive evidence that the country is running the risk of a shortage of electric power unless nuclear power can be made competitive with fossil fuel-generated electricity—by subsidy or otherwise. There is evidence that nuclear power—if subsidized heavily by the Government—can be advantageous to certain select areas of the country. And, Mr. President, they are not the really depressed areas of the Nation. In fact, they are, for the most part, the already federally impacted and federally favored—defense, space, and installations—regions. There are some few exceptions even within the so-called "favored" regions. I would not deny them such special advantages as would accrue from nuclear power.

The United States is blessed with ample coal reserves—more than 200 billion tons recoverable under present mining technology and at current prices, plus another 600 billion tons minable with improved techniques which will surely come as the need develops. The technology of both the production and transportation of coal is constantly improving. This clearly indicates that not only will additional coal reserves become recoverable in the future but that the downward trend in the delivered price will continue in the future.

There will be a plentiful supply of coal available at reasonably level prices to meet the power needs of the Nation. Therefore, I see no justification for a continuation of the subsidized nuclear power program on the order of the present scope and size.

Perhaps the nuclear powerplants will be needed. They may even now be competitive, as some spokesmen for the electric utility industry insist. If they are

needed, and if they are competitive, these are all the more reasons why the subsidies should be ended.

I do not believe reasonable citizens can object to the Atomic Energy Commission continuing its program of developing and improving the technology of reactor prototypes. This certainly is not a target of my objection. I object to the continued spending of public funds to subsidize utilities to take this Government-developed technology and build large, commercial-size plants—not experimental plants, but large facilities to produce electricity for the commercial market. Other legislators join in this feeling.

We are encouraged, however, by what appears to be a growing awareness on the part of members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that, perhaps, the present program may not be entirely in the public interest in all of its aspects.

At the request of the joint committee, AEC has delayed for at least a year another invitation under the present round of projects for the construction of even larger plants, in the 600,000-kilowatt range.

If I understand the joint committee position accurately, it is that under existing criteria it appeared certain that a water-type reactor would, of necessity, be the only type to be qualified as proven. In fact, the water-type reactor is proven, according to AEC reports.

In other words, what AEC proposed to do was to offer Government financial assistance in building what would be merely a larger version of plants already approved for construction with Government subsidy. This, of course, would make such plants more economically feasible and commercially more attractive, more useful, and more efficient. This has been proven in conventional-type electricity generation.

In its wisdom, the Joint Committee seems to have decided that building another larger plant would not advance the technology of civilian nuclear power. It requested the AEC to delay—and wisely so, in my opinion—further commitments until new and different reactors could be evaluated.

Because there are so many unanswerable or extremely difficult to answer questions about this civilian nuclear power program, I believe it should be leveled off until the Joint Committee has completed its evaluation.

When the fiscal year 1964 appropriation recommendations for the Atomic Energy Commission come to the Senate, the amount of money for the waiver of fuel use charges and for plant design assistance should be restricted to that amount necessary to cover contracts already signed by AEC and approved by the Joint Committee for construction. Such restrictions would not delay any project already approved; it would delay only until an evaluation by the Joint Committee is completed the issuance of invitations by the AEC for further bids from utility companies for the construction of additional large, nonexperimental reactors. But I am convinced that subsidies for these should be stopped.

Mr. President, earlier today, I dispatched a letter to the Chairman of the

Senate Committee on Appropriations in which I expand on these views and discuss other aspects of the subject which I hope will have the attention of the committee. I also make certain suggestions for the committee's consideration. I ask unanimous consent to have my communication to the Appropriations Committee chairman printed in the RECORD following these remarks.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, November 18, 1963.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has reported the public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1964. Under title III—Independent offices—are the recommended appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission.

It is my understanding that a special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations will conduct a closed hearing under security conditions tomorrow morning on Atomic Energy Commission budget estimates.

I have only general comments to make on the classified AEC items; namely, to express the hope that the Appropriations Committee of this body can and will find appropriate ways, without endangering security, to recommend more substantial reductions in funds for nuclear weaponry and special materials than did the Appropriations Committee of the House. In fact, the committee of the other body did not recommend any reduction in the \$783 million AEC estimate for nuclear weapons, and recommended a cut of slightly under \$5.5 million from the AEC estimate of \$480,471,000 for special nuclear materials.

In addition to reductions in foreign aid for which I voted during action on the authorization bill, it has been my hope that there would develop in this session considerable savings in the areas of defense, space, and atomic energy so that vital domestic program needs would not have to bear the brunt of economy chopping to accommodate a tax cut.

We failed to shave the funding for defense below the level of the last fiscal year. It remains to be seen what the action will be with respect to the space and atomic energy programs. But it is my view that we must try harder in these areas so as not to place the bulk of the economy burden on the tools of foreign policy administration and on the programs to meet human and community needs in the United States.

We will soon be confronting our responsibilities and our opportunities in the matter of appropriating for the atomic energy program. I have made observations concerning the special nuclear materials and weapons items of the AEC budget. Those two, together with the reactor development items, account for almost \$1,794 million of the total AEC budget estimate of \$2,423,500,000 for fiscal 1964.

I am not an advocate of shortchanging research in any field, including that of atomic energy. I hope the House Appropriations Committee, in recommending a \$33.5 million reduction from estimates for nuclear reactor development, a cut of almost \$27 million for physical research, and another of approximately \$8.3 million for biology and medicine AEC programs, did not endanger research progress in vital areas.

But I commend for favorable consideration the language in the House committee's report in which it expresses the opinion that continuation of the subsidy program (of development and design assistance to utilities)

is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors, since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

It continues to be disturbing to those of us from conventional fuel producing regions—especially coal economy areas—to be informed that something in the neighborhood of \$200 million remain in the House committee recommendations, and more than that in the AEC budget estimates now before the Senate committee, for grants to utilities under the reactor development program of the AEC.

Mr. Chairman, huge subsidies have been paid to utilities to aid in nuclear power development to make such power competitive with that generated by coal-burning and oil-burning plants. But I know of none having been paid or pledged to progressive investor-owned utilities making very large investments in new plants in the coalfields to generate extra high voltage electricity for transmission to the load centers where energy requirements are increasing.

The subsidies to utilities to aid them in nuclear power development are both shocking and inequitable when compared with the small amounts of coal research subsidized by the same Government which is aiding utilities to find ways to substitute nuclear energy for coal and other conventional fuels. Here, then, is Government assistance for an effort to destroy coal markets without a compensatory degree of aid and effort to help research and develop new uses and new markets for coal. There must be parity. This is simple justice. Nothing less will suffice. If an amount on the order of \$200 million annually is subscribed in research and development and design assistance to further the progress of nuclear power, why should coal research and development not be accorded a similar amount in Government subsidies? We must give profound consideration to the fact that the electric power market is coal's major existing outlet—indeed, its last frontier until some radical breakthrough in coal research creates a vast new horizon.

In light of these factors, it should be understandable that the current activity of the Atomic Energy Commission which, more than any other, is of the greatest concern to the conventional fuel industries—particularly coal—is that of subsidizing construction of large, nonexperimental commercial nuclear electric plants embodying the pressurized water or boiling water reactors.

I am aware that section 110(c) of Public Law 87-701 (AEC authorizations for fiscal year 1963) authorized the Commission to furnish funds for design assistance to utilities, notwithstanding the no subsidy provisions of section 169 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. This, in my judgment, was a mistake and it should have been corrected.

It is difficult to understand how the Government subsidization of these large commercial plants—conveniently termed "demonstration plants"—can be justified. Nevertheless, the AEC is in the process of working out contractual arrangements for the construction of three such plants in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt range. The plants and the amounts of direct AEC subsidy involved are as follows:

	Fuel waiver subsidy	Design subsidy
Southern California Edison.....	\$6,500,000	\$6,522,960
Connecticut Yankee Atomic.....	7,145,000	6,050,000
Los Angeles Department of Water.....	8,200,000	8,000,000
Total.....	21,845,000	20,572,960
Grand total.....		42,417,960

I hope it will be the consensus of the Appropriations Committee of this body that, as the House committee has stated in its report, "continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate construction of power reactors, since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive cost, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs."

In fact, I feel there is justification for suggesting that there be provided in the fiscal 1964 appropriations for the AEC a prohibition against the use of any such funds, under the civilian nuclear power program, for construction of additional water reactors or any type of reactor which has been proven.

There should be no arguing the fact that the water reactor concept is thoroughly proven.

(A reactor concept is considered by AEC to be proven when it has developed to the stage where engineering feasibility has been established or where reactor experiment or prototype experience has demonstrated confidence in reactor reliability for the general size contemplated.)

Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, the AEC Chairman, has stated that the pressurized water and boiling water reactors are examples of proven concepts.

In its report to the President of the United States on civilian nuclear power, November 20, 1962, the Atomic Energy Commission declared that water reactors "have definitely arrived." To this assertion the AEC report added: "They are reliable and safe. It is believed that large reactors of this type could now be built and operated in high cost fuel areas with a lifetime promise of greater economy than conventional plants."

This being the case, why should the Government continue to subsidize utilities for any water reactor installation or design assistance? And why should the Government subsidize their supply of generating materials? Let the nuclear-minded utilities finance their own capital expansions and fuel requirements, as do utilities using conventional fuels in their generating processes.

And for those who do not recognize the pace of nuclear power development, or who possibly wish to cover up the facts, attention is called to appraisals by utility executives who declare that "nuclear kilowatts" are on the threshold of being competitive with "fossil kilowatts"—and mainly because of the impetus given to the development by the Government, much of it at the direct expense of long-established conventional fuels industries. Please note the following:

John V. Cleary, senior vice president of the Consolidated Edison Co., in defending his company's investment in a 275,000-kilowatt nuclear power plant with a proven water reactor, declared: "The Indian Point station is one of the company's production plants, essential to the production of electricity to meet our present load requirements. In fact, it is classified as a base load plant." He added that his company plans to install an even larger nuclear power plant with the same type of water reactor in the Borough of Queens, New York City, and one major consideration for the decision to build this plant (Ravenswood) is that, "from a cost standpoint, it will be competitive with our latest so-called conventional plant."

Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co., has stated that two of the large nuclear power plants listed to be built on the east coast and west coast with Government subsidies of over \$12 million each for design assistance and fuel waiver, "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil fuel plants in the same location." He added that on a "nonsubsidized basis nuclear kilowatts will be competitive with fossil

kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States" by the time these nuclear power plants go into operation in 1967-68.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, we have it on the authority of the Atomic Energy Commission and of spokesmen for the investor-owned electric utilities that we are not dealing with experimental plants in these large water reactors. They are of proven concept, and, according to authoritative and highly-placed utility executives, they can compete with coal-fired plants in some sections of the Nation today on a nonsubsidized basis.

Westinghouse and General Electric, I am informed, are commercially producing and selling the water reactors to private utilities. I am told that one atomic expert has said that "these reactors have become so pedestrian that you can just about walk in and buy one off the shelf."

The question arises, then, as to why continued Government subsidy is necessary to encourage the construction of proven, commercial nuclear plants.

Although Consolidated Edison has announced it will not seek a design subsidy or waiver of fuel use charges for the first 5 years of its intended Ravenswood operations (Queens, New York City), as will be provided the Southern California Edison, Connecticut Yankee Atomic, and Los Angeles Department of Water plants at a cost of more than \$42 million in taxpayers' dollars, we know these Government-provided benefits will accrue to Consolidated Edison:

Use of Government-owned nuclear fuel at Government interest rates instead of the much higher private financing rates; also, \$500 million in indemnity insurance from the Government at significantly less cost than private insurance; and the sale to the Government at a fixed price of \$10 per gram of the plutonium manufactured in burning the Government-owned fuel.

Mr. Chairman, in the case of the three plants—two in California and Connecticut Yankee—scheduled for construction in the immediate future with subsidies which probably will exceed \$42 million, we recognize that contracts already are signed and that payments will be made from appropriations provided AEC in prior years.

But it seems to me that there is a clear-cut need for the Congress to insure that no Government funds are pledged to the subsidization of additional large, commercial nuclear power plants which use the proven pressurized water or boiling water reactor. I hope that there will not be appropriations made for such purposes and, indeed, that there be prohibitions against using appropriated monies for any new utilization in this area.

Perhaps the long range solution to the problem lies in amending the Atomic Energy Act to make more explicit the procedure the AEC must follow in licensing plants of proven design as commercial installations, rather than as experimental or demonstration plants.

Respectfully submitted,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

LIFE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this fall Mr. Edwin McDowell, editorial writer for the Arizona Republic toured the Eastern Europe satellite nations and Russia and relayed his observations in a series of articles for his newspaper. This is an extremely perceptive series on life behind the Iron Curtain and I recommend it to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WALL OF SHAME—IRON CURTAIN STILL MOCKS LIBERTY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Edwin McDowell of the Republic's editorial writing staff, a thorough reporter and a long-time student of communism, has just completed a 6-week European news-gathering tour. With satellite communism as his main objective, he spent much of his time in that bank of unfortunate countries which were forced into communism at the end of World War II, and are the worse for it. He also dipped briefly into the Communist fountainhead, Russia itself. This is the first of 12 dispatches reporting on his trip.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

WEST BERLIN.—"Something there is that doesn't love a wall * * ." I thought of those words, the opening line from Robert Frost's "Mending Wall," as I stood today at Checkpoint Charlie in West Berlin and looked at the forbidding wall of shame that separates East and West Berlin.

I am not the first to be reminded of that poem by the sight of the naked, brutal face of communism.

Just last year, before a hundred Muscovites, Frost himself created an international stir when he recited his poem, later saying its selection was mere circumstance, that the wall alluded to is somewhere in New England.

Perhaps.

But the poem was not lost on the Muscovites. Nor was it lost on the millions in this divided city to whom the wall is a living reminder of the totalitarian way of life.

Especially the verse which says:

"Before I built a wall
I'd ask to know
What I was walling in or walling out,
And to whom I was likely to give offense."

What the Communist hierarchy walled in, without asking to know whom it was likely to offend, were the hopes of an estimated 17 million men, women, and children of Germany's Soviet zone, 1.1 million of them in East Berlin.

And no wonder. For until the Communists erected the wall on August 13, 1961, more than 3.5 million Germans, including the cream of the Eastern Zone's professional and working classes, fled westward, severely crippling the East German economy.

Viewing the wall, as I did early this morning before journeying into East Berlin, I was struck by the thoroughness with which the Communists carried out their task of erecting a memorial to man's inhumanity to man.

Across the top of the 9 miles of wall runs 6,000 miles of barbed wire and countless pieces of jagged glass, cemented in place.

A total of 193 main and side roads have been affected by the closure.

A strip of soil, barren except for scattered land mines, separates the wall from another wall of barbed wire.

Dozens of doors and windows of houses on the eastern side of the border have been bricked up by the Communists.

Barbed wire and tripwires for alarms are strung along the rooftops.

On this side of the Spree River, East German guards, their rifles and submachineguns at the ready, lurk behind barricades in seemingly abandoned houses, ready to shoot any refugees fortunate enough to get through the barbed wire on the other bank.

And even a cemetery adjoining the border has been walled in, as though to remind the world that not even the dead can rest in peace in a Communist garrison state.

The wall has cost an estimated \$25 million, or just about \$1.50 for every remaining East German—a telling commentary about the value communism places on the lives of its subjects.

Yet, although the Communists have doubled their guards since the erection of the wall, still the refugees come.

More than 13,000 have made their way to freedom during the past 2 years, through tunnels, by crashing locomotives or armored buses through barriers, by swimming icy streams.

But most refugees today are Communist border guards. Defections continue despite two-man guard units, so that each guard can watch the other, and despite no soldier knowing ahead of time who will be his partner during the next 8-hour tour of duty.

Three days ago two border guards, aged 20 and 21, climbed across barbed-wire obstacles near Brunswick and fled into West Germany, saying, "We can't stand conditions in East Germany any longer."

But not all who try to defect make it.

That same day, travelers at the autobahn checkpoint at Marienborn watched East German guards murder a would-be refugee who tried to crash the barrier in an army ambulance.

The man crashed through the first barrier pole of the checkpoint, but Communist border guards and customs officials sealed the compound and began firing at the ambulance with submachine guns and pistols.

The vehicle finally stopped when its tires were burst by steel spikes mounted on latitudes. The refugee jumped out and tried to run across the border. But he was shot a few more times, collapsed, and finally was carried away by the Communists.

Everywhere along sidewalks near the wall in West Berlin—on Bernauer, Sebastian, and Treptower Streets—are makeshift memorials to those who were killed trying to escape to freedom.

Crosses, freshly decorated with flowers and barbed-wire wreaths, mark points where refugees were shot while trying to swim the Spree.

Rough stakes with nameplates below rooftops and sealed windows commemorate the spot where an old woman jumped to her death in West Berlin, rather than remain in the Communist sector, where a 20-year-old student died from a rooftop plunge after he panicked while being chased by East German police (Vopos) and jumped to his death after misjudging a fireman's net awaiting him four stories below.

Always visitors to the wall can see the watching, waiting East German police, sometimes stoical, sometimes smiling broadly across the no man's land that separates two ways of life, oftentimes training field glasses on camera-wielding spectators, but always on the alert, always ready to challenge a wayward move, an untoward gesture.

Yet even those West Berliners who are most vehement in their denunciation of Vopos who kill their own brothers for the sake of some vague, future worker's paradise, admit that many Vopos hate communism as badly as do those in the West.

It would have been impossible, they say, for so many refugees to have made it to freedom if some of the Vopos had not suddenly acquired poor marksmanship.

Nevertheless, for all practical purposes the wall has put an end to the flow of refugees. For whereas stone walls may not make a prison of the human spirit, this formidable stone wall has undeniably made a prison of East Berlin.

Gazing down on the wall from a platform on the West Berlin side I thought of what a friend, a U.S. correspondent to a Mediterranean nation, told me recently—that the Iron Curtain no longer exists, that it stopped existing sometime during the past 10 years.

It is true that the phrase "Iron Curtain" is largely due to the rhetoric of Winston Churchill, who coined it during a postwar speech in Fulton, Mo.

But it is also an accurate description of the nations of the Red empire which are enclosed behind 2,000 miles of electrified barbed wire fence which divides the Communist and non-Communist world from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

True, between Austria and Communist Yugoslavia, for example, the Iron Curtain is largely nonexistent. The barbed-wire, armed patrols, and minefields simply do not exist.

But there are deadly minefields elsewhere along the East-West border and Communist border police still carry live ammunition in their guns.

Furthermore, if the sight of the tangled mass of barbed wire, of concrete, of jagged glass lining the Berlin wall does not prove that an Iron Curtain does in fact exist, a visit to the West Berlin museum just yards from Checkpoint Charlie should do so.

There are hundreds of photographs of a dying Peter Fechter being carried away by four Vopos after being allowed to bleed for hours at the foot of the wall.

Pictures of the crumpled bodies of children, some less than 10 years old, who were shot trying to escape to the West from a tyranny they were not yet old enough to understand.

Photographs of an East German father dropping his child from the fourth floor of a building into the outstretched net of West German rescuers below.

And pictures of a young West German bride tossing a bouquet to her tearful mother imprisoned on the Communist side of the wall.

Yes, the Iron Curtain still exists, embodied in this wall of shame.

And standing at Friedrichstrasse, alongside Checkpoint Charlie, it is clear who and what that "something there is that doesn't love a wall."

It is the millions of refugees who gave up everything they owned for the opportunity to live in freedom and with dignity.

Similarly, it is the unfortunate millions still behind the wall, those who were not lucky enough to escape, but who have not yet stopped hoping.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Since this report was written, two more East German border guards escaped to West Berlin while on patrol. The two, 22 and 21, jumped across barbed wire fences last Wednesday night, leaving their weapons behind and asking for asylum.)

EAST BERLIN LIFELESS AND DRAB—COMMUNIST WONDERLAND BREATHES DECAY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Here is the second of a series of articles on satellite communism by one of the editorial writers of the Arizona Republic who has just completed a 6-week trip through Europe and Russia. Today's installment takes you behind that infamous wall.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

EAST BERLIN.—"The wall erected by the German Democratic Republic is a precaution for keeping out Western spies and provocateurs," intoned the young East German guide without the slightest trace of embarrassment.

As he droned on, pointing out the accomplishments of his socialistic fatherland, I had difficulty following him.

For I wondered what in fact he was describing—some far-away Elysium, some worker's paradise of the future, or the East Germany whose streets and byways I was viewing even then.

As I write this, I have been in East Germany less than 2 hours. Thus far, however, I have been unable to rid myself of the

feeling of depression, of malaise at having viewed communism first hand.

For East Berlin is supposedly a showcase of communism, a model of Communist efficiency and ingenuity designed to surpass, or at least equal, the *wirtschaftswunder* (economic miracle) which West Germany has attained under a democratic government, a government which has no need for walls and barbed wire.

To hear our guide describe it, one would think it truly was a showcase, something just this side of heaven, or whatever other location would please a doctrinaire Communist.

In reality, however, East Berlin is an appendage, a useless part of a larger and more vital body—in this case West Berlin, a city whose heart, and more important, soul, is on the other side of the wall of shame.

It is a lifeless city comprised of drab stores and solemn, unsmiling people who, when they look at tourists at all, stare at them through disbelieving (or, perhaps more accurately, uncomprehending) eyes, as though they were from some other world.

I say this realizing that it is an elementary truth of the psychology of perception that what one sees depends often upon his beliefs and expectations.

As Prof. Sidney Hook has observed, the stronger the beliefs the more they function like *a priori* notions whose validity is beyond the tests of experience.

Nevertheless, the above description of East Berlin is accurate; the differences between East and West Berlin are both startling and depressing.

CONTRAST TO WEST

Only a few days earlier I sat among the patrons of the picturesque sidewalk cafes of Paris, and watched bustling, lively French men and women parade along the Champs Elysees, the Rue de la Paix.

There was a bounce in their step, their conversations were animated, and there was an air of excitement and verve in their comings and goings, the same air of excitement and verve one finds on all the main avenues of major cities in the democratic West.

But today there was no excitement, no bustle, no life in either the eyes or the measured steps of the scattered few who strolled aimlessly along Karl Marx Allee.

"You know, I was last here in 1936," a middle-aged Austrian confided, waving his arm up the deserted East Berlin Street. "At that time this street was mobbed with people, and there were lots of gay cafes. Now look at it. You can't believe it's the same place * * * I just can't make myself believe it."

His incredulity was understandable. It must have been difficult to remember this largely deserted main street as a former beehive of excitement.

STREETS DESERTED

There were no window shoppers except tourists. Yet just a few miles beyond the wall, in West Berlin, thousands of strollers were gazing in store windows, stopping to sit at sidewalk cafes, or just walking, happy to be out in the sunshine.

The only ones who seemed to be enjoying today's sunshine in East Berlin were the teams of armed patrols roaming the city and the lonely old men in shirtsleeves leaning out of far away windows.

Only once, when we passed a small park, did I see strollers who exhibited even a flicker of enjoyment.

But even there, few young people were to be seen.

That is what first caught my attention and what bothered me most—the lack of young people anywhere in East Berlin.

Once I caught a glimpse of a small boy on a bicycle; another time of a young mother walking her two children toward the church.

And, as I said, our guide was a relative youngster, effortlessly repeating by rote all the clichés he had been taught by his Communist employers.

CITY FOR AGING

But by and large, East Berlin struck me as being a city for the aged or aging:

For the superannuated, who no longer dreamed of anything better, and therefore accepted whatever befell them.

For those who had been too poor, infirm, or weary to leave when they had the opportunity.

For those whom a lifetime of drifting with the prevailing political or ideological currents taught to believe they could coexist with anything.

And, of course, for those opportunists who found in communism the opportunity they wanted to exercise authority, to attain status; persons who believe, as Milton's Lucifer, that "to reign is worth ambition though in hell; better to reign in hell than serve in heaven."

It was depressing to see faded signs advertising beer that had been sold in rathskellers and pubs before the regime decided that any but state-owned brews and alehouses were indications of capitalistic decadence.

BOLD POSTERS

Those poignant reminders of things that used to be, but never more will be, are being replaced by bold propaganda posters, by bright billboards heralding the worker's circus soon to arrive in town (but where will the children come from to laugh at the Communist version of Emmet Kelly?) and signs announcing the latest drama at the state-run Maxim Gorky Theater.

Rubble from the last war dots every section of the city, and each time we passed another scene of wreckage the guide dutifully explained that the regime was planning—the date was unspecified—to build a new hospital, a new library, new workers' apartments, a park, or some other new welfare measure for the toilers in the vineyards of communism.

Nor did the guide stammer when he pointed out the Adlon Hotel, a rundown establishment which in earlier times, before the Nazis and before the Communists, rang with shouts of laughter at the sad-faced mime in baggy pants, Charley Chaplin, and which resounded with kudos for the lovely, talented, enigmatic Garbo.

HITLER DIED HERE

Near the Adlon is the bunker marking the spot where Adolf Hitler, the principal totalitarian fanatic of another era, committed suicide when his megalomaniacal dreams of grandeur were shattered by Allied bombs. I managed to suppress a smile momentarily when I thought how fitting it was that Hitler should be entombed on this side of the wall.

Viewed from this perspective, the contrast between East and West, between communism and noncommunism, between freedom and slavery, is the contrast of drabness and decay with freshness and vigor.

It is the contrast between the bustling Champs Élysées and the clear steady gaze of those who stroll along the Friedrichstrasse, and the dreariness of Karl Marx Allee and the empty gaze of those inmates of East Berlin, upon whose backs rest the burdens of the world, and who look with unresponsive, mournful eyes on visitors from the West.

It is the contrast between the freedom of the West and the arbitrary, capricious Red tape of the East which kept us waiting 2 hours before we could gain admission to the Red wonderland.

It is the contrast between the freedom of democracy and the insolence of office inherent under a despotism which requires brick walls, barbed wire, and guards to enforce its will.

CZECH COMMUNISM DISGUISED—BUT REGIMENTATION TAKES ITS TOLL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Before the Communist coup d'état in 1948, Czechoslovakia was well on the road to economic prosperity and political freedom. This on-the-scene report from Prague, by Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell, describes the Czech capital as it is now.)

PRAGUE, CZECHOSLOVAKIA.—Communism has left an indelible mark on this old city.

It is not the mark of barbed wire fences, minefields, and border guards carrying sub-machineguns, although the barbed wire fence separating the western border of Czechoslovakia from Austria and from West Germany makes use of all three methods of discouraging escape.

By and large, the overt signs of totalitarianism, at least as we in the West conceive of them, are missing from Prague.

The soldiers—it would be inaccurate to describe them as troops—one sees throughout the city are not booted, spit-and-polish servants of communism.

Rather, they impress outsiders as being every bit like young men elsewhere in the world when caught up in a nationwide compulsory draft—young men like those you knew a decade earlier in your own country, fulfilling, as best they are able, an obligation that is at best tolerable but most often loathsome.

This is not to say that no Czech believes in communism.

Many do. Both our guides, for example—one a 45-year-old woman, the other a nervous young college student—spoke of the glories of Czechoslovak socialism (although it was obvious the young student was far from convinced).

And Czechoslovakia boasts the highest percentage of Communist Party membership of any country in the world—roughly 1.6 million of a total population of 14 million.

But communism here is far more subtle than in East Germany.

There, the bearded puppet, President Walter Ulbricht scowls down on the masses from every public office (and every office in East Germany is a public office) and every way station.

Here, one has to make a conscious effort to find a picture of Czech President Antonín Novotný, the former hard-line Stalinist.

Novotný's apparent shyness may be attributable to the fact that he played a prominent role in the conviction of Rudolf Slansky, former secretary general of the Communist Party, who was hanged in 1952 on charges of espionage and high treason.

FALSELY ACCUSED

For just recently, the party finally admitted that Slansky had been falsely accused (an endearing sentiment of questionable value to Slansky), and Novotný will be unlikely, at least in the immediate future, to mitigate his part in the affair.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Since this report was received, Novotný ousted Premier Vilém Široký, two deputy premiers and several ministers. The official charge was for shortcomings in their work and "certain mistakes in past political activity." Inasmuch as Široký also played a prominent part in the Slansky purge, the move is thought to be an effort by President Novotný to divert blame from himself.)

Thus, with "big brother" keeping discreetly in the background, and no Russian troops to be seen anywhere (except for a delegation at the airport, welcome to Prague with innumerable hugs and many flowers), the brutal face of communism is well disguised.

But Communist regimentation has taken its toll on the Czechs in other ways.

One who queues up to eat in a worker's automat (a drab, dirty version of Horn & Hardart's) can't help but notice the men without socks, the poorly clothed old women, and the bland food.

TOURIST FOOD GOOD

Good food is available in Czechoslovakia, of course. But that is reserved for the tourist, at a cost comparable to an evening spent at Manhattan's swank Four Seasons restaurant.

What is good and plentiful is the pastry. Apparently even communism has not yet discovered a way to render it tasteless and unappetizing.

Regrettably, for a city which once boasted luxurious restaurants and fashionable shops, Prague today is a city which has completely divested itself of originality and fashion for the Communist promises for the future.

There is no private enterprise, as is apparent from a sojourn down Prague's main street.

State-owned shops offer few worthwhile goods, and those only at prices far beyond the means of the average Czechoslovakian (whose living standard, incidentally, is said to be the highest of any Communist nation).

Alcoholism is said to be a major problem (perhaps because Communist malt does more than Milton—or Marx—can to justify God's ways to man).

MECHANICAL ACTIONS

And every action seems to be mechanical, perfunctory, as though it were being performed by automatons instead of humans.

Last night, for example, we attended a nightclub at our hotel (whose name, the Yalta, is significant in the history of Communist expansion).

We were amazed to watch the mechanical manner in which the musicians went through their paces, playing "Tenderly" and "On the Street Where You Live" in almost the same rhythm, at almost the same speed. (I thought it appropriate when the group—comprised of deviationists, no doubt—struck up "Don't Get Around Much Anymore." I think its composer, Duke Ellington, would have been less pleased, for it too resembled each preceding song.)

But what seemed most significant was the fact that regardless of what the musicians played—and the repertoire of musicians in this Red nation seems decidedly circumscribed by the boundaries of capitalism's Tin Pan Alley—nobody, absolutely no one, applauded. Not even to be polite.

And yet, I remembered, why should anyone? After all, the musicians were employed by the State, were playing state-owned instruments in a state-owned nightclub in a state-owned hotel, and were responsible solely to the state.

TWIST BRINGS LIFE

So why then should anyone applaud—any more than one applauded the driver of the snowplow that cleared your street on a snowy winter morning, or any more than a postman received applause for performing that duty for which the Government hired him.

Only when the combo struck up a twist number (which they did precisely every 25 minutes, in accordance with God-knows-what regulation of the Ministry of Music) did the jaded atmosphere disappear.

After that, during "Cocktails for Two" (somehow reminiscent of the old Spike Jones version of what is ordinarily a beautiful song) and "Fascination," it was back to the same old tempo, the same old lackluster mechanical performance, the same blasé audience reaction.

The cold war is being waged in Czechoslovakia, but on a minor scale.

Western newspapers and books are banned in Czechoslovakia, as—insofar as it is possible—are Western ideas.

Our student guide confided that he was permitted to listen to "propaganda broadcasts" from the Voice of America and, furthermore, that he was subjected to Western authors in literature courses at the university.

CUBANS IN PRAGUE

In a rare sarcastic moment, I said I was sure he was, and further said I imagined he meant Theodore Dreiser, Jack London, Mark Twain, Langston Hughes, Charles Dickens.

He smiled, nervously I thought, and said, yes, that was true—that they didn't have time to study every Western writer, therefore they concentrated on the representative ones.

I tried gently to explain that while each of the above was a major writer, taken as a totality they were hardly representative of the whole of Western literature.

Somehow I felt he didn't believe me. And when he began reciting a poem by Langston Hughes—something about how Negroes were forced to eat in the kitchen whenever whites were around—I knew we were talking about entirely different subjects altogether.

There are many Cubans in Czechoslovakia, but their numbers, I am told, are being reduced.

We saw them often—in the hotel lobby, on trolleys, at the airport, on the street. They are here to train in industrial plants and on Czechoslovak farms.

(Thousands of Communists from all over the world are here to study in special labor schools. In addition, some 3,000 Communist and non-Communist students from 80 nations also are studying in Czechoslovakia.)

CZECHS IN CUBA

Approximately 2,000 Czech technical experts are reported to be in Cuba, working to bolster Castro's faltering economy.

Czechoslovak aid to Cuba in 1962 amounted to \$100 million, up more than 800 percent from 1960. Included in this were tools and heavy industrial goods, as well as foodstuffs, bicycles, and auto parts.

Czechoslovakia is being systematically exploited by its Communist masters to aid communism elsewhere.

On a per capita basis, Czechoslovakia gives more aid to underdeveloped Red nations than does even Soviet Russia—\$48 per capita up to the end of 1960, compared with about \$16 per capita by Soviet Russia.

Apparently the Red brain trust stands the drain, inasmuch as this nation of one-half of 1 percent of the world's population accounts for almost 2 percent of the world's industrial output.

But the economy of this beautiful country is far from rosy. Last year the Government decided to abandon its current 5-year economic plan only 2 years after its inception; it hopes to undertake a more ambitious 7-year program beginning next year.

As always, weighty statistics don't begin to tell the story of communism in Czechoslovakia or elsewhere.

LACK OF FREEDOMS

They tell nothing about the lack of freedom to change jobs; the endless lines and queues for foodstuffs; the empty and drab store windows; the sameness of the state-owned restaurants; the absence of any but Communist news, movies, and literature.

They tell nothing of the sad-faced old women and men who go about their humdrum routines, hoping that they can get through another day without offending their Communist bosses.

They tell nothing of the memories of those who knew freedom and prosperity before the Second World War, and again briefly before the government of President Eduard Benes fell to communism with a world-wide crash in a lightning coup d'etat on February 25, 1948.

For most Czechoslovakians, life, if it is not happy, is at least predictable.

There is enough to eat, at least by Iron Curtain standards. And if the individual Czech's reach is not allowed to exceed his grasp, his Communist masters have a ready explanation.

For communism, its propagandists never tire of reminding the populace—through

newspapers, on the radio, in the cinema, and on billboards—is the wave of the future, not a promise of the good life here and now.

And so the Czechs wait, and hope, and (although religion in Czechoslovakia is today largely a remnant barely tolerated by the state) perhaps even pray.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The day after this report was received, a 37-year-old Czechoslovak anesthesiologist, Dr. Jaroslav Kremel, defected from a 25-member group of medical men touring the United States. He gave as his reason the fact that "spiritual terror reaches into all areas of public and private life" in his Red homeland. He said further that he had seen in the United States that "people do live in such a free atmosphere as the majority of the Czechoslovak people can no longer imagine.")

MINDSZENTY REMINDER OF REVOLT—DESPITE DEFEAT, BUDAPEST IS ALIVE, INVITING

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Memories of the abortive 1956 revolution remain vivid to both Hungarians and their Red rulers. The effect of that revolution is reported by Edwin McDowell, Republic editorial writer who recently completed an extensive tour of the Communist satellite nations.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

BUDAPEST, HUNGARY.—On the sidewalk outside the U.S. Legation here, small privately owned flower stands, similar to those seen on most street corners in this picturesque city, add to the beauty that is Budapest.

Inside the Legation, where he has been a refugee for almost 7 years, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty puts in another day of prayer and of taking occasional strolls in the courtyard.

No two incidents more accurately show the contrasting faces of Hungary:

To a Westerner getting his first look, Budapest is everything that East Berlin and Prague are not—alive, gay, and inviting.

But to Cardinal Mindszenty, a servant of God in a nation ruled by godless men, and to others who oppose the Communist rule which was forced upon this nation in 1949, Budapest is the imprisoned capital of a captive nation.

Perhaps more than anything or anyone else, Cardinal Mindszenty is a haunting reminder of those fateful days in late 1956 when, for one brief moment, it appeared that a revolution against overwhelming odds, the might of the Soviet Union, just might succeed.

He is a reminder of those first few glorious days of the fighting, when the warm breath of victory was in the air—days reminiscent of the early days of the French Revolution, about which Wordsworth was to write:

"Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
But to be young was very Heaven."

And, sadly, Mindszenty is also a tragic reminder of the failure of that revolution, and with it the final crushing of the independent spirit of Hungary. Small wonder that Hungary's Red government would like to see him leave the country, and is reportedly petitioning the Vatican for just such an arrangement.

It is perhaps too harsh a judgment to say that the independent spirit of Hungary has been finally crushed, in the sense that finally implies irredeemably.

DEFEAT NOT TOTAL

For while the brave Hungarians lost the battle, and perhaps, at least for the foreseeable future, the war, their defeat was not total. They won something in the process: The right to live their lives with a larger degree of freedom than their neighbors in East Germany and Czechoslovakia.

Those two nations were drab. But Hungary is abuzz with excitement, heightened by the dozens of colorful shops run by private individuals who incur official Commu-

nist displeasure. (Unofficially, the regime pretends not to notice the flourishing private enterprises.)

Unlike Czechoslovakia, where religion exists solely at the sufferance of the Communist Party and where the clergy is paid by the Government, Hungary remains proudly, at times disdainfully, religious.

And while religion appears to be losing its appeal to the young, churches still are crowded on Sundays and holy days. Catholic schools exist, and the Catholic Church even maintains a college where Marxism-Leninism and the principles of dialectical materialism give way to the teaching of Augustine, Aquinas, and to other less temporal studies.

RED PRESSURE SUBTLE

Furthermore, even though the ubiquitous Red star shines forth from the tops of many buildings, and even though posters exhort workers to give their all for Marx, Engels, and the promise of a worker's paradise, most Communist pressures are far more subtle than one might expect.

Nowhere, for example, do visitors see pictures of Janos Kadar, the figurehead Premier installed in power by the Russians during the 1956 revolution.

Nor does one see any trace of Soviet troops, although an estimated 50,000 to 60,000 remain in Hungary.

"Yes, there are Russian troops here," the guide replied in answer to my question. "But not in Budapest. They're stationed outside the city."

"Where?"
"Who knows?" He shrugged his shoulders, as though he wished he could be done with the question. "We Hungarians really aren't interested enough in the Russian troops to go looking for them."

In fact, despite this relative measure of freedom from the Communist iron grip, the result of Kadar's badly wanting respectability in the eyes of the West in order to court Western trade, the dominant impression left with visitors is that Hungarian youths really aren't interested in much of anything.

YOUTH INSULATED

What perhaps has insulated Hungarian youth against the larger questions of freedom and oppression is the realization that during Hungary's moment of decision in 1956, the West could offer no response other than to watch and debate while Soviet troops and tanks rolled over the revolutionaries.

Conversations with these youths leave the impression, valid or not, that the major concern of most Hungarians is how to exist with a minimum of trouble and a maximum of enjoyment.

In the July issue of *Encounter*, Arthur Koestler, himself a former native of Hungary and a onetime devoted Communist, noted that the new Europe is neither Huxley's brave new world nor Orwell's 1984.

Ideologies, he said, are on the wane; poverty is on the way out. The new shape of society is one of managers, technocrats, official planning, chromium, motels, and motorways.

But the new European youth, Koestler observed, seem "to have no aspirations except getting on in their professions, marrying early, and going on holidays in the family car. Thus, this superhistorical age has produced a generation which seems to live outside history. Under the parabolic orbits of intercontinental missiles they have peacefully settled down to cultivate their little gardens."

IDEOLOGY DOMINANT

This is largely hyperbole; Ideologies may be on the wane elsewhere in Europe, but they still dominate the thinking of those who hold the Iron Curtain countries, including Hungary, in bondage.

If Hungary does not precisely resemble Orwell's 1984 (and superficially it does not), it is not because its rulers have abandoned

the idea of depicting truth as falsehood, good as evil, war as peace.

It is largely because for one brief, shining hour, in a dawn which now seems ages ago, today's blasé Hungarian youth cared enough about those larger questions—cared about more than merely cultivating their little gardens—to strike a blow that was heard round the world.

Some observers here feel that if and when the end of ideology, specifically the ideology of freedom, is crowded out by the younger generation's hedonistic search for pleasure, Hungary truly will be lost.

What worries the Communists of this nation of 10 million is that in the meantime they may be losing the cold war battle by default.

NO ACTIVE REVOLT

Not that the awesome power of communism is any less. With 50,000 Soviet troops only minutes from Budapest and countless Red divisions only an hour or so away, no one, not even the most hardened anti-Communist, has any illusions on that score.

But the Hungarian response to Communist importunity has been what military top sergeants accurately label "silent contempt," the sullen expression of silent hatred or resentment even while obeying orders.

Nowhere is this more apparent than in the Hungarian reaction to propaganda—Communist newspapers, periodicals, and books (the only publications allowed).

Rarely, it seems, does anyone bother reading them. Only the true believer takes Red doctrine with anything less than a truckload of salt. And true believers, in a nation which experienced what this nation did just 7 short years ago, are hard to come by.

Our guide, of course, was a Communist. And it is even possible that he believed in that "true communism" he extolled at irregular intervals.

RED FAULTS ADMITTED

But even he admitted that East Germany is one vast prison camp, that the Soviet path to economic and industrial progress has been watered with the blood of millions of innocents, that free elections are nonexistent in Hungary, and that a barbed wire fence and armed guards still patrol the border between Austria and Hungary (although restrictions against travel, to Communist and non-Communist countries alike, have been eased during the last year).

His only justification was that someday Hungary, and what he termed the "other Socialist states," will evolve in the direction of freedom, a direction I gently reminded him the Western democracies have long traveled with some degree of success without the need for pogroms and repression.

Despite Hungary's ordeal, however, her exterior remains independent and seemingly carefree.

From the moment we stepped off the plane and were greeted at the airport with a Muzak version of "Autumn Leaves," we were never far from music.

OMNIPRESENT MUSIC

On the radio, which, unfortunately, relies heavily on that unique American contribution to the arts, rock-'n'-roll, and in cafes and restaurants, music accompanies the Hungarian day and night.

Even though the nomadic gypsies who survived Communist purges have been assimilated into the mainstream of national life, having abandoned their wanderlust and fortunetelling (a risky business at best in a Communist nation), the lachrymose gypsy violin and the haunting gypsy music remain fixtures of Budapest.

The visitor preparing to leave here can do so only with a deep feeling of sadness for its people, a sadness occasioned by wondering what the coming days will bring.

Another revolution appears unlikely, at least in the foreseeable future, for always

there is the grim reminder of those 50,000 Russian troops.

Yet I say this realizing that a brief stay does not give any but the very foolish the right to predict anything about any country, and especially about a country so volatile as Hungary.

I say it also realizing what Spengler meant when he said, "An earthquake reveals only the pressures that have built up in many years under the earth's surface."

For if revolution appears out of the question, so too, remembering the history of the Hungarian people, does complete acquiescence.

Somehow it is difficult to imagine that the descendants of the fiery patriot Lajos Kossuth and of the Hungarian Freedom Fighters of 1956 ever will be content merely to settle down peacefully to cultivate their little gardens while the Red grip remains tightened around their Hungarian nation.

POLES DEFIANT OF RED OVERLORDS—NATIONAL SPIRIT LINKED WITH FREE WEST

(Throughout history, the Poles have shown an independent spirit toward despots and dictators. Today's Poles are no different. Although the Polish nation is ruled by a Communist government, the Polish people are often openly disdainful of their Red captors. Here is another in a series of reports from behind the Iron Curtain by a Republic editorial writer.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

WARSAW, POLAND.—The body of Poland is bound to the Soviet Union by the Warsaw pact, signed here in 1955 at the Radziwill Palace.

But the heart, the mind, and the spirit of Poland remain linked to that spirit of freedom associated with the West.

For even while Poland is ruled by the Communist government of Wladyslaw Gomulka, and even while two Russian divisions are encamped in western Poland, few Poles have a kind word to say about communism.

No Red stars shine down on the Poles from the tops of Warsaw buildings.

No propaganda posters or banners strung across streets exhort workers to meet monthly quotas.

And religion flourishes among Poland's 30 million people, 95 percent of whom are Roman Catholics.

The defiant spirit of the Poles, whose heads are bloody but still unbowed after 16 years of total Communist control, was apparent from almost the opening remarks of the guide who met us at the airport.

"See that monstrosity," he said as we neared the city limits, indicating the tallest skyscraper in Poland. "That is the Palace of Culture and Science, designed by Soviet architects and built by the Russians in the years 1952-55. It was supposed to be a gift, but"—and here he smiled sardonically—"we had to pay, of course."

A short distance later, he spoke glowingly of the "great October" of 1956, that time when the balky Poles demanded, and were given, assurances of more liberal rule.

It was on this wave of liberalism that Gomulka, postwar Polish Communist leader who was ousted by Moscow in 1948, was swept into office. It was agreed that the long-time harassment against the church would be ended, that secret police would be called off, and that private enterprise would be allowed to flourish on the farm.

PROMISES SHORT LIVED

But, Poland is discovering Communist promises are short lived.

The secret police terror, according to informed Western sources here, still does not exist as it once did. But deviants are regularly summoned to some anonymous bureau or agency, given a stern lecture, and warned to toe the Marx.

Poland's farms (about 85 percent privately owned) remain the only ones in all the satellite nations not yet collectivized.

Yet it is the church which remains the principal bete noir of the Red government. And despite its promises of 1956, the regime systematically has continued to crack down on it.

It has clamped new restrictions on the movements of the clergy. It has banned parochial schools and religious instruction in public schools. And it has instigated a whole series of harassments—confiscatory taxes on church property, building restrictions, etc.—to curb religion in Poland.

Undoubtedly the Communists would have been far more successful with their anti-religious vendetta were it not for Stefan Cardinal Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland.

Again and again Cardinal Wyszynski, who was imprisoned by the Communists from 1953 to 1956, has denounced the Red government of Poland.

CHURCH DEFIES REDS

Two years ago, he decried the Communist persecution of the church and said Catholicism would not bow to the Red "Caesars."

In a series of Lenten sermons last year, Cardinal Wyszynski again asserted publicly that there was no religious freedom in Poland, and once more vigorously attacked the Communist atheistic propaganda.

And when Gomulka recently accused Polish bishops of opposing the philosophy of coexistence enunciated by the late Pope John in his encyclical *Pacem in Terris*, Wyszynski, just days before my arrival in Poland, and before an audience of more than 50,000 persons, challenged the Polish Communist regime to live up to that encyclical they so much profess to believe.

Thus the war continues, becoming more and more bitter, causing increasing concern among Western officials and those in the West who have championed Poland's independence from Moscow.

It is agreed that sooner or later the deep cleavage between church and state must be resolved, and as of now it appears that when it is, the government is likely to win.

Despite increasing restrictions, however, and despite inspection of outgoing and incoming mail, Poland still retains a degree of freedom found nowhere else behind the Iron Curtain (with the exception of Yugoslavia, which is not really an Iron Curtain country.)

Non-Communist literature from the West is generally obtainable at libraries and occasional newsstands.

PRESS CRITICAL

The Polish press now and then criticizes the government (although lately the regime has demanded closer obedience to the party line).

Abstract art, which has so enraged Khrushchev, abounds in Warsaw, and is displayed in semi-official art galleries.

Furthermore, Warsaw coffee houses serve as meeting places for dissidents critical of the regime.

One such coffee house, *Nowy Swiat* (New World), resembling a long, narrow hallway, was crowded as usual after work yesterday. And, amid coffee, beer, wine, and ice cream, it was alive with conversation.

At the far end of the room sat an intense young piano player, which perhaps is not unusual in the city of Paderewski and Chopin (whose heart, incidentally, is contained in an urn in Holy Church).

What does strike first-time visitors as unusual, however, is that he was playing modern jazz, interpretive versions of "Lullaby of Birdland" and "Love Walked In" in a style that sounded somewhere between Erroll Garner and Ahmad Jamal.

This 700-year-old city has undergone a major transformation since prewar years. It is no exaggeration to say that it has risen Phoenix-like from the ashes, inasmuch

as it was largely reduced to rubble by the Nazis during the occupation.

The causes of Nazi displeasure were the effective, courageous Polish underground, which sometimes seemed almost to make captives of the captors, and the large-scale Polish uprising against the Nazis during the last days of the war, which greatly offended the high command of the Third Reich.

(This uprising, interestingly enough, affords a prime example of Communist duplicity. For the Soviets knew that an effective Polish underground would seriously hamper Red post-war plans for Poland. Therefore, in order to crush that resistance beforehand, the Red army, which earlier had arrived at the gates of Warsaw, broadcast an appeal to the Polish patriots telling them the time had come to join their Russian brothers in a final assault against the Nazis.

(When the resistance forces came out into the open to battle the mighty Nazi Army, the Red army sat passively across the Vistula River and watched the ensuing carnage. When they finally occupied Warsaw, the Soviets arrested the remaining resistance leaders and deported them to Russia for trial. Others disappeared without even the semblance of a trial.)

Thus the rebuilding of Warsaw continues. But not fast enough. Apartments remain scarce, and this scarcity has been aided, as in Budapest, by a wholesale migration from the farms and countryside.

The result is that today there is an estimated 5-year wait for a new apartment. And it is literally true that newlyweds oftentimes are required to live apart for as long as 2 years, awaiting living quarters.

Last winter's severe cold, among the worst in European history, took its toll in a widespread crop failure, repercussions of which in the form of food shortages, are being felt even today.

A drought this summer and the doubling of fuel and electric prices this spring already has presaged conditions which many believe will lead to a winter of severe discontent in Poland.

But it is generally thought the Poles will survive as they always have survived, and none expects last winter's sporadic strikes (indicating unhappiness with food shortages) to become widespread.

In other words, Red Poland (containing 1.4 million Communists, an indeterminate but large number of whom are mere opportunists) is expected to continue along its quasi-independent path.

And for most Poles, that is enough for the present time.

But not for all of them.

SOME STILL ESCAPE

For it was just a couple of months ago, many will remember, that a major in the Polish Air Force escaped with his wife and two children to West Germany in his jet plane.

His reason? To some it may sound strange, especially to those who consider that the Poles have it relatively good (what with generally enough to eat and an unprecedented measure of freedom for an Iron Curtain country) and that the pilot had a position of no small consequence as a major in the air force.

But he felt otherwise. His reason was that despite his relative well-being, that intangible ingredient called "freedom" was missing in his homeland, freedom, that concept with Aneurin Bevan described as the right to go to Waterloo Station, plunk down his money, and buy a ticket to wherever he bloody well pleased.

That kind of freedom is missing in Poland. And, sad to report, most observers here believe it will be a long, long time before it is rediscovered.

RUMANIA RULED WITH IRON HAND—HAPLESS PEOPLE DREAM OF TRAVEL TO WEST

(Rumania has been a longtime faithful Soviet ally. But in recent months, her leaders have expressed unhappiness with the role assigned to the country by Russia in the Communist-bloc economic union. The Republic's Edwin McDowell, who has just completed a trip through the Communist satellite nations, explains why Rumania is unhappy.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

BUCHAREST.—When World War II ended, there were fewer than 1,000 Communists among Rumania's 16 million people.

Today, in a population exceeding 18 million, Rumania boasts more than 1 million Communists.

And the country's Red dictator, Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej, has been in power since 1952, longer than any leader in the Iron Curtain nations.

"It is difficult to become a Communist in Rumania," our guide, a member of the Young Communists (UTM-ISTI), told us. "You must belong to the UTM-ISTI until you are 26. Then you have a 2-year trial period, after which you are given a rigid examination. Only those who pass are then eligible to become full party members."

"The principal requirements for party membership are two: You must be hardworking, ready to make any sacrifice for the party. For example, you must be prepared to volunteer to work on your days off and at night, if your services are needed."

"And second you must have class conscience, an understanding and love of people."

No one can doubt that Rumania's Communists are anything but hardworking. Whether or not they have class conscience depends upon whether one views them through the pink-tinted glasses of Marxism.

For while this nation has achieved a 3-year industrial growth rate of just slightly less than 16 percent, highest among the satellite nations, its workers are said to be the poorest in the Soviet bloc (a reported per capita income of less than \$140).

More importantly, unlike neighboring Hungary and nearby Poland, Rumania's Red leaders have shown no indication that they intend to relax their repressive rule.

"I hope to travel to the other Socialist (i.e., Communist) nations in the next year or two," the guide said. "I just can't imagine a life without travel."

She may not be able to imagine it, but her superiors in the Communist Party can. And ever since the party came to power after the rigged elections of 1946, party officials have seen to it that none but trusted Communists have ventured abroad.

That attitude still holds. But, as a simple matter of dollars and cents, the regime has decided to court increased trade and tourism with the West.

And she is courting both, using techniques employed by Madison Avenue men in gray flannel suits.

TRAVEL AGENTS HERE

Last night at the hotel we talked briefly with a group of travel agents from England, brought here as a good-will gesture by the Rumanian Government.

And there are more than passing indications that Bucharest is prepared to settle some outstanding political problems with the United States (specifically, Rumanian treatment of certain American citizens) as part of an inducement to Yankee tourists.

Within the past few weeks two of President Kennedy's sisters, Mrs. Stephen Smith and Mrs. Peter Lawford, enjoyed brief holidays here, a fact considered to be of more than passing significance.

Furthermore, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman recently visited Bucharest,

marking the first time an American of cabinet rank has done so.

Every Rumanian thus far has gone out of his way to be friendly. And this includes workers and ordinary citizens not actively engaged in courting Yankee dollars.

But it will take more than mere friendliness to convince the average American traveler that this is a vacation wonderland, especially when he discovers that the finest hotels here do not supply soap, nor do they keep it on hand.

A combination of pleading, demanding, and finally, the equivalent of 35 cents in U.S. money produced a bar of foul-smelling soap from a nearby store.

Or when he discovers that elevators have a penchant for being out of order during the operator's lunch hour.

TRADE WITH WEST

As of now, there is less than a million dollars worth of trade a year in each direction between Rumania and the United States. But Red officials from here are out beating the bush for heavy machinery from the United States, and as of now Western technicians outnumber Russian technicians in the land.

There is a decided Soviet influence here, of course, which is not surprising inasmuch as Rumania was "liberated" by the Soviets on August 23, 1944. To commemorate that heroic assistance, the regime thoughtfully designated its modern 80,000-seat football (soccer) stadium and surrounding grounds as "Park of the 23d of August."

The facts are less romantic than Communist mythology admits. When Rumania broke with the Axis on August 23, 1944, a coup d'etat was staged by the two non-Communist parties which had been the main political bodies before the installation of the Fascist dictatorship.

But with the aid of the Red army, and by the imposition of the "war criminals law" which was administered by a Communist, and used as a weapon for eliminating persons deemed undesirable by the Communists, the Reds formed a terrorist force which enabled them, through a "national democratic front," to gain control of the coalition.

After a Communist power play failed, Andrei Vishinsky arrived here and demanded an immediate change of government. The king stalled, but Vishinsky changed his mind by arranging for a display of Soviet military might. Thus the Communist Groza government was installed.

Then came the rigged elections, followed by mass arrests and persecution said to have exceeded anything ever witnessed in the brutal history of Rumanian politics.

Although the Soviets are no longer here, the hammer and sickle is everywhere evident. Today, emblazoned across a trolley car-barn in the Rumanian countryside, was a sign boldly proclaiming, "Proletari Din Toate Tarile Uniti-Va." Or, as Marx proclaimed in the opening line of "Das Kapital," "Workers of the world, unite."

The Red star is not confined merely to buildings, parks, and workers' apartments, however.

Last night the circus from Russia was in town. And, along with Rumanians from all walks of life as well as the inevitable visiting firemen from Kansas City, I was in the audience.

The endless string of acrobats, strongmen, balancers, and acts in the juggler vein proved that the Russians can be every bit as boring as the Ed Sullivan show.

PROPAGATE COMMUNISM

But the circus was important from another viewpoint: It showed how the Soviets wisely take advantage of every opportunity to propagate communism.

One act depicted Russian space dogs (muttniks, presumably). On another oc-

casion the master of ceremonies released dozens of white doves of friendship.

And at the end there were endless boasts of friendship and good will between the Soviets and their Rumanian brothers.

Inevitably, from high above the big top (in reality, a modern indoor auditorium), the hammer and sickle was in full view as a constant reminder.

Non-Communist literature is verboten in Rumania. And the local press (translated and placed in hotels for anyone who might like to read a tome with his morning coffee) is so boring and so patently tendentious that it makes the writing in the Worker appear, by comparison, absolutely scintillating.

Occasionally a Western movie manages to get its nose under this country's tent. Across the street from our hotel Brigitte Bardot is appearing in "Babette Pleaca La Razboi," which, if memory serves, is approximately 2 years old and is titled "Babette Goes to War."

I have no idea of the social message conveyed in the film, although, since it features la Bardot, I can guess. But I can be sure the local minister of culture has no reason to believe it will have a baneful, corrupting influence on Communist faith.

When "The Apartment," with Jack Lemmon and Shirley MacLaine, played here last year, the party distributed leaflets explaining that the movie was really about decadence in New York City. It would be interesting to know what impressed the Rumanian audience more, decadence in New York City or the apartment, sumptuous by Communist standards, of an ordinary New Yorker.

Western influence has made its mark with the twist and U.S. music. During the past few minutes the big, brassy band six floors below, in the outdoor restaurant, has given forth with "Blue Skies" and "Hernando's Hideaway."

The only signs of private enterprise are the few remaining repair shops (for shoes, watches, etc.) which one finds scattered along side streets near the downtown area. But these, our guide told us with satisfaction becoming a good Communist, are heavily taxed and therefore are gradually disappearing.

UNIFORMLY DRAB

When they do, it is safe to predict that Bucharest streets will become uniform, and uniformly drab, like the city's eight workers' districts (containing apartments, schools, clinics, a cinema, and stores) of which our Communist guide was so proud.

As in Czechoslovakia, the church (here mainly Greek Orthodox) is dependent on the state, from which the clergy draws a portion of its salary. Although the regime permits worship, it has so discouraged religious attendance that only the very old, the very foolhardy, and the very devout dare risk party opprobrium by attending church regularly.

"Few young people believe in God any more," a sophomore at the University of Bucharest said omnisciently. "After all, we learn in school that religion is merely a superstition. But there are always those who feel better when they can pray to a Supreme Being, with a beard and all that. You know."

Indeed I did. Yet I wondered how she reconciled her boastful atheism with her penchant for religious symbols, specifically, a Turkish pendant she wore around her neck, on which (according to her earlier translation) was inscribed "God Bless You."

It would be unwise to expect any serious changes in Rumania's relationship with the Soviet Union. But there have been strains and stresses in the past which, for a time at least, gave reason for hope.

Principal among these was Rumania's role in Comecon, the Council of Mutual Eco-

nomic Association established by Moscow in 1949 as communism's answer to the Marshall Plan.

Last year Khrushchev, hoping to reinvigorate Comecon invited Outer Mongolia to join Russia, Rumania, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, East Germany, and Albania in the supposedly integrated economic union, whose partners would concentrate on producing what each can produce most efficiently.

RAW MATERIALS WANTED

This meant that Rumania (together with Hungary and Poland) was to supply raw materials and goods to the other Red nations.

But Rumania was already engaged in steel and petroleum production of her own, and therefore was reluctant to abandon her long-standing plans to become what Red boss Gheorghiu-Dej called a "garden for the Socialist countries."

Furthermore, Rumanian party leaders were irked at Czechoslovakia (which, along with Russia and East Germany, was supposed to concentrate on heavy industry and production of heavy machinery) for allegedly pawing off goods of inferior quality to her Comecon partners, while selling the quality goods in the West.

Therefore Rumania balked, and decided to develop her own natural resources. At the same time she began making ostentatious overtures to Red China and Albania.

Now, apparently, all is harmonious once again between Bucharest and Moscow, at least until a denouement is reached over the Comecon feud.

And peace, Communist style, once more reigns in this isolated and largely ignored land.

IN RUSSIA IT'S 46 ATGOSR—NIKITA SCRAPPED THE STALIN REIGN OF TERROR

(Russia's regimented society in no way resembles the democratic societies of the West. Nevertheless, the reign of terror associated with the Stalin era has been scrapped by Khrushchev, at least for the time being. Republic's Edwin McDowell explains why.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Moscow.—In most nations of the world, years are designated either B.C. or A.D.

In Russia, years are measured from either before or after the "great October Socialist Revolution."

If a visitor hears that expression once he hears it a hundred times during the course of an ordinary tour in Russia.

"This part of the river used to be dirty and polluted, and often overflowed its banks," our guide explained, indicating the Moscow River over which we were driving. "But after the great October Socialist Revolution, Soviet engineers began work on it. Today it is perfectly sanitary and it no longer overflows."

"This is our trade union building," the same guide explained later that afternoon, pointing to a large and rather plain structure not far from Red Square. "Before the great October Socialist Revolution it was owned by Russian nobility."

"There was 76 percent illiteracy in Russia before the great October Socialist Revolution," the guide informed us in the midst of a discussion about Soviet schools. "Today there is no illiteracy."

And so it goes, until by the end of a day's tour one's head is reeling from trying to keep two sets of facts and figures clear in his mind. A day or so later they will mean nothing to most visitors. But they will have served their intended purpose of impressing upon visitors how much Russia has progressed since that great October Socialist Revolution almost 46 years ago.

Statistics on the number of new apartments for workers; on the number of new buildings in Moscow; on the number of

industries in Russia; on the total labor force; on improvement in living conditions; on increased steel production; on the number of books published and read.

The only thing that keeps this statistical saturation from being totally boring is the reminder that you have heard it all before, in much the same manner, in those price-less Lichty "Grin and Bear It" cartoons.

MOSCOW IMPRESSIVE

But for all the pride of its Communist spokesmen, for all their boastfulness and chauvinism, Moscow is truly impressive.

It is spacious, it is modern, and it is clean, particularly so for a city which ranks in population only behind Tokyo, London, New York, and Shanghai.

It has numerous parks and public squares. And yet despite its size and the number of buildings (already I've forgotten how many), it is possible in this city, which Maxim Gorky described as the heart and brain of Russia, to feel as far removed from the nexus of urban civilization as one feels while strolling on a deserted South Jersey beach on a morning in late September.

The Communists are undeniably proud of their showcase. "Since there is no private ownership of land," an official brochure boasts, "it is possible to reconstruct and build up Moscow according to a rational over-all plan."

But—forgive me if I sound hypercritical—somehow, despite the parks, despite the public squares, despite the spaciousness, despite the incongruous beauty of Red Square and the formidable Kremlin walls and grounds, their 70 acres dotted with spirals and towers, despite all this, something is missing.

There is a sameness about Moscow which lulls the senses into an esthetic limbo, into a kind of numbness, so that the first-time visitor is convinced that whatever slums exist in Moscow are also uniform, rundown according to some overall plan drawn up after the great October Socialist revolution.

PEOPLE A DELIGHT

What makes this city a delight are its people. Russia, as many Americans forget, is made up of 15 republics (hardly "independent republics" as official propaganda proclaims) boasting more than 100 nationalities.

Many of these people can be seen walking through town in their colorful native dress, and it requires effort to remember that this is Moscow, not Culver City, and that these are authentic costumes, not Hollywood reproductions of how the Mongols and Tatars dressed centuries ago.

For just as New York is a mecca for tourists from all over the United States, Moscow is a mecca for Russian tourists, as well as for Communists from around the world who come, like pilgrims to Jerusalem, to pay homage to the memory of their gods.

And just as Broadway and Times Square are the principal first-time tourist attractions of New York, Red Square and Lenin's tomb are the main attractions here.

This morning, promptly at 10:45, viewers began the steady procession past Lenin's body. Two hours later they were still streaming by, and the line extended down the street as far as the eye could see.

LENIN REMEMBERED

Lenin, of course, remains the spiritual godfather of communism and tributes to him can be found everywhere throughout the city: There is the Lenin Library, with its more than 22 million publications; the Central Lenin Museum; Lenin Hills; and the 103,000-seat Lenin Central Stadium.

But the laurel wreaths of communism wither quickly, and it is not surprising therefore that another spiritual godfather has not come off so well in Communist hagiography:

One never hears anything about Josef Stalin, no buildings or streets are named after him (even Stalingrad is now called

Volgograd) and his bust was conspicuously missing from a row of busts within the Kremlin yards commemorating important Communist leaders of the past.

Even the loquacious guide admitted that, "Yes, Stalin was guilty of grave sins with his cult of personality," before resuming her statistical analysis.

One thing virtually all knowledgeable westerners agree on is that the reign of terror in Moscow is ended. This usually means different things to different people, but generally it means that the sense of oppression and terror that was so common during the Stalin era has faded, to a marked degree.

THOUGHT VASSALIZED

At one time, after returning from the Soviet Union, Andre Gide was to write, "I doubt whether in any country of the world, even Hitler's Germany, is thought less free, more bowed down, more terrorized, more vassalized."

Today in Moscow, as throughout Russia, thought is still not free. Prof. Philip E. Mosely, director of studies of the Council on Foreign Relations, has pointed out that clashing viewpoints in the fields of literature and education signify only the hope by contending factions that in time Khrushchev will back their proposals against those of competitors.

The secret police are still active, Mosely says, still watching and writing things down in case Khrushchev decides to restore the atmosphere of terror.

And neighborhood or block meetings are still held in Russia, in which unproductive members can be expelled from their dwellings on order to remain away from home, a subtle reminder of what Lenin meant when in 1937 he wrote:

"In a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means death by slow starvation. The old principle: who does not work shall not eat, has been replaced by a new one: who does not obey shall not eat."

Granting all this, however, the fact remains that Khrushchev, somewhere along the line, decided to replace the stick with the carrot.

A GLORIOUS FUTURE

He is still willing to resort to the cudgel whenever he deems it necessary, as the Soviet performance in Budapest in 1956 proved. But until it becomes absolutely necessary, from his point of view, Khrushchev seems content to relax internal pressures and make the Russians want to join him in building a "glorious future."

His lifting of the reign of terror has produced results which 5 or 6 years ago would have been thought impossible.

"When I first came here in 1958, you would meet a Russian in a restaurant or in the hotel and he would be scared to talk to you," said the Belgian businessman sharing my table at dinner. "He would look at you, see you were a foreigner, and get away fast."

"Since then the Russians are completely changed," he said. They are allowed to talk with foreigners and they want to talk with them, to ask how much a suit you are wearing cost, ask what it is like outside Russia. Today they are encouraged to talk and there is a world of difference."

Furthermore, suspicion of foreigners on the part of the Government is disappearing. A Western newsman who knows Russia well remarked that it is unusual today for suitcases and belongings to be searched in hotels, whereas a half dozen years ago that procedure was commonplace.

FREEDOM TO TRAVEL

Another visitor from the United States, a noted anti-Communist journalist who speaks Russian fluently, spent a month traveling through Russia recently and said he was never followed nor interfered with in any way.

Westerners I've talked with attribute this condition to the fact that Khrushchev, no matter what his final goals may be, and no one I've spoken with doubts that his ultimate goals are any different from Stalin's, desperately wants to appear to the world as a man of peace.

And of course the decades-long reign of terror under Stalin so conditioned the Soviet people to obey automatically while eliminating those free spirits disinclined to do so, that Khrushchev can afford, for the time being at least, to relax the Communist grip without fear of losing control of the people.

As for Communist Russia's treatment of visitors, even visitors from the decadent capitalistic nations of the West, it is above reproach.

For this is the age of the thaw as far as the outward face of Russian communism is concerned. It is the age of the spirit of Camp David, the spirit of Geneva, the spirit of the nuclear test ban, all rolled up into one.

And Khrushchev, the master conductor, is leading his Red performers in a symphony of sweetness, an overture of conciliation, hoping to convince his foes in the West, and within the Red bloc as well, that beneath the ursine appearance of the man on the podium beats the heart of a gentle person, a man who in the year 46 ATGOSE (after the great October socialist revolution) desires only peace and friendship.

RUSS PROPAGANDA EVERYWHERE—SOFIA NOT ALLOWED TO FORGET RED ARMY

(Bulgaria's Communist rulers continue to crack the Red whip over their subjects. Communist propaganda is everywhere. And Bulgaria is as regimented as any Communist nation in Europe. In this report, Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell, who recently returned from a visit to the satellite nations, describes conditions in the Bulgarian capital.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

SOFIA, BULGARIA.—There no longer are Soviet troops in Sofia.

But the ruling Bulgarian Communist Party has taken pains to insure that, while the Russians are out of sight, they are not out of mind.

Near the center of this lovely city is a park in which is prominently displayed the monument to the Soviet Army.

The monument is inscribed: "To the Soviet army, our liberator, from the grateful Bulgarian people."

Communist propaganda is everywhere.

From almost every store window glares forth pictures of the two latest Soviet cosmonauts, Valentina Tereshkova and Valeri Bikovski, who rode to fame in Vostok capsules last June.

Strung along the road leading from Sofia to the nearby Vitosha Mountains are colorful banners proclaiming, "Long live peace and friendship between nations."

Over the entrance to a large building project is the slogan, "The fatherland front is fighting for peaceful building of our system."

And written across the passageway of a new apartment complex for workers is simply, "Peace—Labor—Socialism."

Furthermore, although we arrived too late to witness Bulgaria's major holiday, September 9, windows are still filled with posters reminding Sofians to be properly festive. And across each major street are still strung reminders of the celebration, red, green, and white pennants, the national colors of Bulgaria.

"You should have been here for the September 9 celebration," our guide enthused. "Everyone was drinking; the men were embracing girls and women in the street and in the park. It was wild, but it was a fine time."

I agreed that I should have been there—partly, I suspect, because I always felt I missed something not being in Times Square or downtown San Francisco to celebrate the end of World War II.

For the 8 million inhabitants of this Iron Curtain country, there is no letup from the endless propaganda.

RUNS TIGHT SHIP

Its Red ruler, Todor Zhivkov, runs what in the navy would be called a "tight ship," meaning that he is a virtual dictator.

He has made some recent concessions, such as allowing some private enterprise on the nation's farms (more than 96 percent collectivized). But this was aimed largely at stimulating farm production which is floundering around prewar levels.

The major concession granted by Zhivkov (who, it is said, catches cold whenever Khrushchev sneezes) has been his purge of Stalinists in the Bulgarian Government.

Furthermore, in return for the privilege of opening a trade promotion office in New York, the regime not long ago agreed to a \$3.5 million settlement in conflicting commercial claims.

Sofia is also seeking to entice tourists from the West. And although visitors are not flocking to Bulgaria, and although the sight of a tourist's camera still brings numerous interested glances and stares, tourism is increasing.

The government is trying to provide facilities. The Rila Hotel, for example, was built only last year especially for the tourist trade. But already it is in a state of disrepair beyond belief for a building so new.

RUN DOWN, DIRTY

Despite charwomen who seemed to be everywhere dusting and scrubbing, the hotel (which one guest mockingly dubbed the "Comrade Hilton") was as run down and dirty as a hotel 20 years older.

Furthermore, the plumbing didn't work, shelves were pulled out of the walls, and this afternoon, from 12:30 to 2:30, the hotel was without water. This, I learned from the telephone operator, is a daily occurrence for reasons which thus far have been inexplicable.

"Yes, we have private homes and apartments," our guide explained in response to my inquiry. "In fact, it is possible to borrow money from the government to build a dwelling, with repayment over 20 years."

Later in the day I discovered from non-Communist sources, that the statement was true for the most part. The regime does permit private ownership of apartments (mostly cooperatives) and a few houses. And it occasionally has funds available for such purposes. But the waiting period is usually unduly long, and is complicated by a staggering amount of redtape.

This situation, apparently unique in a Communist country, probably has two causes: The regime has been unable to provide sufficient dwellings of its own. And because of a typically Bulgarian attitude reflected in a local proverb: "Give a Turk money and he will buy a wife. Give a Bulgarian money and he will buy a house."

PROPAGANDA ABOUNDS

(As one Western diplomat wisely remarked, the Bulgarian way is probably wiser inasmuch as anyone with a house in these parts can just about be assured of getting a wife.)

Earlier this morning I dropped in to a party bookstore and purchased an elementary English reader to sample Communist propaganda. I wasn't disappointed.

On the very first page appears "The International," the Communist call to arms, with its militant opening lines:

"Arise, ye prisoners of starvation,
Arise, ye wretched of the earth,
For justice thunders condemnation—
A better world's in birth."

An excerpt from George Eliot's "The Mill on the Floss" is said to depict the tragedy "of every family ruined by the merciless law of capitalism."

A selection from "Pride and Prejudice" is preceded by an editor's note explaining: "The satire on bourgeois notions of marriage and patronage, trying to destroy the healthy impulses of life, attains the excellence of a classic."

EYES ON CHILDREN

And the reader contained a touching story, "Loyal Miss Ferch," about a 30-year employee of a U.S. Government bureau. One day the Idaho-born Margaret Ferch disappears without a trace, after a fellow employee tells the authorities that Miss Ferch once asked "I wonder if Russia is as bad as she is painted?"

The schoolbooks of Bulgarian children undoubtedly follow a similar line, for the Communist Party maintains an active interest in the young. All over the city children up to age 10 wear blue neckties, the marks of the Tshavdarche, a young organization named after a revolutionary who fought against the Turks.

From 10 to 15, students belong to the Dimitrov Pioneer Organization, named after another noted Bulgarian Communist.

At age 15, progressive and responsive students are eligible to enter the Youth Communist League.

Bulgaria's trouble with communism began when she withdrew from her alliance with Germany and the war August 26, 1944.

Soon afterward the Soviet Union declared war and Bulgaria immediately asked for an armistice. Three days later the Soviets invaded. In the following days they installed a leftwing coalition government (the Fatherland Front), and on the 5th day accepted the armistice.

RIVALS DESTROYED

During the next 14 months, until the election November 18, 1945, the Communists within the coalition used their control of all but six ministries (including control of the police and courts) to destroy the rival parties while keeping them officially in the government coalition.

Andrej Vishinsky was dispatched to Sofia after the election, in which the unopposed Communists polled 86 percent of the registered vote.

He tried to get the opposition to accept two cabinet posts, hoping to give some semblance of legitimacy to the Red takeover. But opposition leader Nicola Petkov refused.

The next year, after the opposition polled one-third of the votes in the 1956 election, Petkov was arrested and hanged. Soon afterward, the principal opposition party was dissolved, all other fragments of parties were absorbed, and a Soviet-style constitution was adopted.

Since then there has been no opposition to Communist rule, and no indication that there soon will be.

REDS BUCKLE DOWN

Having thus established their rule, legitimate only by Communist standards, the Reds have buckled down to the humdrum task of trying to make a success of a system which Prof. Leonard Schapiro of the London School of Economics terms "essentially absurd."

"We are building for the future," a local Communist told me—self-defensively, I thought—when he learned that I was from the United States. "We are prepared to make necessary sacrifices today for a better tomorrow."

The average Bulgarian, one not imbued with Marxist-Leninist visions of the future, must fervently be praying for just such a better tomorrow * * * one vastly different from all his arduous yesterdays.

THE ULTIMATE PRICE—A FIRSTHAND VIEW OF COMMUNISM

(Communist guides boast of the low cost of goods and services in Soviet Russia. Edwin McDowell, Republic editorial writer, maintains in this dispatch from Moscow that the low cost is an illusion * * * that the Soviet populace has paid the ultimate price, many times over.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

Moscow.—The those who want to understand communism, a special committee of the American Bar Association counseled, "We prescribe, not a 15-day trip to Russia, but 15 days in a library studying the Communist conspiracy."

And of course the ABA is right.

For, try as he might, the average visitor—to Moscow, Milan, or Miami—is almost sure to interpret what he sees and hears within the framework of that which he was sure he knew before he arrived.

Valuable though the days spent studying in a library are, however, a trip to Russia can be valuable also—especially for anyone interested in a firsthand view of rationale of communism.

For example, when I asked the Communist guide whether there were any opposition political parties in Russia, knowing full well the answer, she replied, "No, there is no need for more than one political party. The Communist Party in Russia represents all the people."

When I reminded her that all one-party systems claim to represent all the people, as for example the Government of Spain, she had a ready explanation of the differences between Khrushchev's Communist Party and Franco's Falange Party:

"Our government is democratic, Franco's is a dictatorship."

Having thus clarified that question she moved on to a further recitation of those numerous statistics Russian guides come well equipped with.

Later in the day she dutifully recited what I had read earlier in a propaganda brochure conspicuously placed on our hotel table—that "the U.S.S.R. is the readiest country in the world." And in her best actuarial manner, she proceeded to rattle off facts and figures to support her boast.

That's when I asked her opinion of Boris Pasternak as an author and poet.

"Pasternak was sometimes good, but not always," she replied reluctantly. "Sometimes his works did not reflect reality."

"Which of his works do you feel most lacked reality?" I inquired, again knowing in advance what her answer would be.

She hesitated a moment, trying to decide, I thought, whether or not to continue with the subject of Pasternak. Then she answered, "Dr. Zhivago."

"In what respect did Dr. Zhivago lack reality?"

"In many respects."

"In his belief that life is more than a lump of raw material to be processed and molded by other men?"

(The exact passage, I discovered later, when I returned to my room, reads: "When I hear people speak of reshaping life, it makes me lose my self-control * * * Reshaping life. People who can say that have never understood a thing about life. They look on it as a lump of raw material that needs to be processed by them * * * But life is never a material, a substance to be molded.")

"That and much more. Nowhere did it represent life as it is."

"Is that why the book was never published in your country?"

"Yes. You must remember that we can't possibly publish everything."

I decided not to remind her of her boast, just minutes before, that one-quarter of all the books of the world are published in the

U.S.S.R., "the 'readiest' country in the world." Instead, I asked, "Who determines whether a book reflects reality?"

"In Russia the people, through specialists, decide what reflects reality."

"Is it possible that the judgments of the people, through these specialists, might be wrong?"

"Perhaps. But not often enough for us to worry about it."

"Pasternak was awarded the Nobel Prize for Dr. Zhivago, I'm sure you realize. Is it possible those judges could have been correct in their assessment of Zhivago as a major work of literature?"

She chose not to answer directly. "As you know, the Nobel prize is given to much that is not literature."

I did not know, to be honest. For at that moment I couldn't recall a single author who had been awarded the Nobel prize. Inexplicably, the names of Camus, Eliot, Hemingway, and Faulkner had completely slipped my mind.

But it was obvious she was uncomfortable with the subject and much preferred to return to her statistical analysis. So I merely smiled and, grudgingly, decided to let the subject die.

We hadn't driven more than half a block when I was tempted to ask her whether "One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich," the novel published a year or so ago in Russia, about slave camps during the time of Stalin, reflected reality. But I let that question go by also, and feigned interest in the endless statistics she was quoting.

Still my thoughts wandered back to Pasternak, the late free spirit in a regimented society, who scored his Communist masters' view of the future by saying:

"Man is born to live, not to prepare for life. Life itself, the phenomenon of life, the gift of life, is so breathtakingly serious. So why substitute this childish harlequinade of immature fantasies, these schoolboy escapades?"

But there seemed to be little point in continuing the discussion further along those lines. And before long I thought of another tour through Russia not unlike the one I was being taken on.

That was when Grigor Potemkin, Catherine the Great's favorite, conducted the Tsarina on a tour of the Crimea he had captured for Russia in 1783. There they were met by happy, smiling peasants who waved from the banks of the Dnieper as the royal party sailed by.

When Catherine returned to St. Petersburg, after visiting the model villages and sights so carefully arranged for her by Potemkin, she was convinced that her Russia was the happy, prosperous nation she had been led to believe * * * never knowing the poverty and misery so carefully concealed by the wily Potemkin.

Today's "Potemkin tours" of Russia are far more subtle. But even here the accent is on the positive.

Great stress is placed on education in the Soviet Union. "All of it free of charge," the visitor is constantly reminded—from grade schools, to Moscow University, to the Patrice Lumumba University of Friendship of the Peoples, where, our guide reminded us, "Young men and women from Asia, Africa, and Latin America study free of charge."

What our guide, didn't mention is that in order to qualify for admission to a university, students first must work for 2 years in a factory or a collective farm.

This requirement sometimes is waived for medical, engineering and science students. But those who wish to study history, social sciences, law, and journalism—areas of "ideological sensitivity"—must undergo the 2 years.

The purpose of this, the guide acknowledged when pressed further about admissions requirements, "is to give our young

people proper respect for the value of labor, even though they may in the future become professionals and not have to labor."

One feature of Soviet life the guides are sure to accent is the low cost of goods and services. The fact that education is completely free is spoken of with awe. And, they boast, "All Soviet citizens will have free rent and free drugs and medicines by 1980."

I was tempted, on more than one occasion, to remind our guide that Soviet citizens have many times over paid for their "free" schooling and for the "free" housing and drugs the future promises. But it was obvious she wouldn't have understood what I was talking about.

What I would have meant, of course, is that ever since the Communists came to power in Russia they have exacted a brutal price from the Soviet citizens.

And although the system of terror has abated since the days of Stalin, they still are paying: In the lack of opposition political parties * * * in the pressures massed against organized religion * * * in having to accept uncomplainingly the few shoddy products the Soviet planners make available to them.

They are paying the price of not being allowed to read any but the official Communist viewpoint. ("The reason we don't sell non-Communist newspapers or magazines on the newsstands," the guide explained, "is because no one wants to read them.")

And they are paying the price of not being allowed to travel or move, except when their loyalty can be assured—most often by the threat of retaliation against family or friends.

Even then it is impossible to guarantee 100 percent loyalty.

Two years ago in Caen, France, for example, a 46-year-old Soviet writer, Vsevolod Kravchenko, jumped to his death from a fourth-floor window. A letter he left behind gives some insight into the hold the Communist system has even on those who contemplate suicide:

"I have never done anything against my country. I am ending my life to avoid unjust accusations and useless suffering. I am accused by my personal 'friends' for certain words which may be interpreted in a hostile manner * * *

"At the end I will say to you one thing: I have served my country honorably with the forces of my talent and energies and never, anywhere, have I betrayed her interest. It is the truth and I countersign it with my blood. I beg my country to believe me and not to avenge itself upon my family and dear ones who are not responsible for anything."

Soviet officials who claimed Kravchenko's body would not, of course, add anything to his reasons for jumping. But those who live in freedom can only guess how awful the terror must be to cause one to take his own life merely because of "certain words which may be interpreted in a hostile manner."

We can only wonder about a system so tyrannical that one bent on self-destruction would find it necessary to beg the rulers of that system not to avenge themselves upon his family and dear ones.

It would have been difficult, if not impossible, for our guide to understand this * * * or for any Communist, dedicated to the proposition that noble ends justify ignoble means, to understand.

What saddens the non-Communist visitors to Russia is the knowledge that when tyranny, or oppression, or regimentation become a way of life, concepts such as freedom or the dignity of man all but lose their meaning.

Even Soviet Writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, currently a Russian favorite, recognized as much when he said about the ordeal of his

fictional Ivan Denisovich, a captive in a world he never made:

"He didn't know any longer himself whether he wanted freedom or not. At first he'd wanted it very much and every day he added up how long he still had to go.

"But then he got fed up with this. And as time went on he understood that they might let you out but they never let you go home. And he didn't really know where he'd be better off. At home or in here."

To some, our Communist guide for example, freedom was far less important than the triumph of communism, the wave of the future.

But to Boris Pasternak, Vsevolod Kravchenko, and millions like them who perished while seeking to prevent the buildup of that Red wave, freedom was something more * * * something, in fact, worth dying for.

HOPE DEEP DOWN FOR COMMUNISTS—THAT MAN HAS RIGHT TO LIVE FOR HIS OWN SAKE

(This report by Republic Editorial Writer Edwin McDowell is his first since emerging from Soviet Russia and from her Communist satellites. It is the 10th in a series.)

(By Edwin McDowell)

ATHENS.—It was mere circumstances that brought me to Athens after emerging from behind the Iron Curtain. I had not consciously planned it that way.

And yet perhaps it was more than coincidence that my journey from nations where freedom is a hollow word * * * where individual man counts as nothing * * * should bring me to the spot where, more than 2,000 years ago, the idea of freedom was born.

For it was in Greece, as Oxford scholar Sir Maurice Bowra reminded us, that politics was first founded on the conviction that "men have a right to live for their own sake and not for the sake of some exalted individual or supernatural system."

It was in Greece, especially in Athens, that democracy was based on the belief that individual man could be depended upon to seek virtue * * * where was born the ideal of spiritually and politically free individuals unified by a spontaneous service to the common life.

Such beliefs are the very antithesis of those which inspire the governments of the Iron Curtain countries.

In none of the satellite nations is man thought to be the measure of all things. In each—under the Communist doctrine advocated by Ulbricht, Gomulka, Kadar, or Khrushchev—he is mere clay to be molded and shaped by the ineluctable laws of science, as revealed to Marx and Engels.

Although it was early in the sixth century B.C., that Solon laid the foundation for the first democracy in the world, in the 20th century A.D., the Iron Curtain governments (as well as many governments outside the Iron Curtain) rule as though Athenian democracy never existed.

"A slave is he who cannot speak his thought," commented the Athenian poet Euripides. Yet even today, millions of people behind the Iron Curtain are not free to speak their thoughts.

WINTER TENNIS

"A people ruling," commented the Greek historian Herodotus, "—the very name of it is so beautiful." Yet it is not the people who rule behind the Iron Curtain, but a handful of cruel and fanatical men who are determined to make the world over in the Communist image.

If, in fact, the Communist world borrowed any example from the experience of Greece, it would seem to be from the city state of Sparta.

"The idea that underlay the young Spartans' training," noted Edith Hamilton, "was their obligation to maintain the power of the state and ignore everything that did not directly contribute to it."

"The goal of human aspiration and achievement was to uphold the fatherland. Only what helped the state was good; only what harmed it was bad. A Spartan was not an individual but a part of a well-functioning machine which assumed all responsibility for him, exacted absolute submission from him, molded his character and mind."

Sparta, of course, was defeated at the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C., and disappeared not long afterward. But before its demise it destroyed Athens, and with it the glory that was Greece.

Perhaps there are parallels to be drawn even today between a political system which values individual freedom and a system whose spiritual leader, Lenin, looked on freedom as a bourgeois prejudice.

And here in Athens it will be possible to think about those parallels once the numbness of having spent time behind the Iron Curtain wears off.

WHO TO BLAME?

For it is a numbness which overtakes visitors from the West when in Communist country after Communist country they encountered the same regimentation, the same assaults against the mind and the spirit, the same relentless pressures to put truth to rout.

Boris Pasternak noted, "What has for centuries raised man above the beast is not the cudgel but an inward music; the irresistible power of unarmed truth, the powerful attraction of its example."

And, predictably, Pasternak was rewarded for his candor the way all critics of communism are rewarded in Communist nations—he was made a prisoner of the system he criticized.

Perhaps the most disheartening, frustrating thing about communism, at least to this observer, is that like all large, bureaucratic systems, it is virtually impossible to assess blame or responsibility.

For where would one begin, and whom would he direct his anger toward?

Toward the kindly, bumbling Communist official of the Bulgarian embassy in Paris who reminded you of the most inept clerk you ever saw?

Toward the guides, mostly college students, who never have been allowed to read or listen to the arguments in defense of democracy or freedom?

TRUE BELIEVERS

Toward the kindly old men and women of the Iron Curtain countries who are living on memories and burnt-out dreams?

Toward the functionaries, shopkeepers, and ticket takers who, like the rest of us, are strangers and afraid in a world they never made?

Toward the Communist soldier who, in the streets of Budapest in 1956 or in Cuba in 1963, merely obeyed orders he most likely neither understood nor cared very much about?

Other than Khrushchev and members of the Presidium, just exactly who is to blame for the specter of communism now hovering over the world?

This, I think, is the most awful problem democracies must face in dealing with hostile, dangerous ideologies.

Perhaps the principal lesson to be learned from Hannah Arendt's recent "Eichmann in Jerusalem" is the fact that it is not necessarily monsters who commit evil in pursuit of what they believe to be a higher good.

Often, perhaps most often, it is quite ordinary men—men possessed by fanaticism; true believers convinced that their way

is the only way—who are able to justify the most monstrous wrongs, the most egregious actions.

NOT INDIVIDUAL

It is the person epitomized by Shakespeare's Isabella when she laments:

"But man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief
authority,
Most ignorant of what he's
most assured,
Plays such fantastic tricks
before high heaven
As make the angels weep."

If there is any value in a visit to totalitarian nations, especially to Communist totalitarian nations, which have been uniquely successful in enlisting the minds of otherwise intelligent people, it is reinforcement of the knowledge that it is not the individual who is different.

What distinguishes the Nazi from the Democrat is not, as some popular writers have contended, an endemic flaw in the German makeup.

What distinguishes the Communist from the Democrat is not, as an occasional writer or lecturer maintains, some inherent flaw in the Russian or Chinese character.

The differences arise from the different gods men choose to worship, from the ideals they cherish, from the beliefs they defend.

JUSTIFICATION EASY

If one is convinced, as were the Nazis, that Dachau and Buchenwald are merely regrettable but necessary way stations on the road toward insuring the dominance of the master race.

If one is convinced, as Communists are, that the laws of history condone forced labor camps, the torture chamber of the Lubianka, state-decreed mass starvations.

If one is convinced of all this, it then becomes a relatively easy matter to justify Schrecklichkeit, that soul-corroding policy of terror which, perhaps clearer than anything else, demonstrates the depths to which man is capable of falling.

Yet despite a general notion that all Communists believe with the same fanatical, inexorable fervor, there is evidence which indicates otherwise:

The apostasy of an Imre Nagy or a Milovan Djilas at a crucial moment for communism.

The slow, painful defection from the labyrinth of communism of a Whittaker Chambers.

Uprisings in Budapest or Poznan, actively supported by those intellectuals and students deemed most trustworthy.

And discussions with those behind the Iron Curtain whose allegiance to Marxism-Leninism is more opportunistic than evangelical.

And why?

SCRAP OF SOUL

It may be because, as Whittaker Chambers expressed it, "in the end there persists in every man, however he may deny it, a scrap of soul."

Or because, as Faulkner expressed it, man has endured through courage and honor and hope and pride and compassion and pity—virtues which not even communism can expunge entirely.

Or perhaps because even Communist man is capable of hearing the inward music Paterick wrote about, of discovering the irresistible power of unarmed truth and the powerful attraction of its example.

Whatever the reason, it provides grounds, if not for optimism, at least for hope, hope that the Communists one day will discover what was discovered here in Athens more than 20 centuries ago—that man has a right to live for his own sake, in search of the virtuous life.

FOCAL POINT ON RED IDEOLOGY—SOVIET PRODUCTION HELD SECONDARY FACTOR (By Edwin McDowell)

It would be easy to ridicule the generally shoddy products for sale in the Communist world, to criticize outdated Communist production methods and to taunt the Red nations for their economic backwardness.

It would be easy to chide the Communist bloc for solving its parking problem by the ingenious method of producing few autos, and then pricing those out of reach of all but the wealthiest citizens.

The temptation is strong to publicize the drabness of Communist shops, the blandness of the Communist diet and the sameness of the workers' apartments.

And many visitors to the Iron Curtain countries have done just that, with the result that Trud, the Russian labor union newspaper, recently described such tourists as members of an "army of ideological saboteurs," out to sway the Soviet people from the Communist path.

But to write off communism for the reasons given above would be a major, and perhaps fatal, mistake.

For in the larger sense, it is not Communist productivity but Communist ideology with which the West must contend.

It is because of this fanatical Communist ideology that the United States spends almost \$50 billion a year on its defense budget.

It is because of this fanatical ideology that our diplomats and officials spend almost every working hour of every day trying to devise ways of containing or otherwise thwarting the Communist juggernaut.

The depths of this fanaticism, this faith that communism can change the world, was lucidly described by Whittaker Chambers, who one day in a New York court was asked by a juror what it meant to be a Communist.

"I hesitated for a moment," Chambers recalled, "trying to find the simplest, most direct way to convey the heart of this complex experience to men and women to whom the very fact of the experience was all but incomprehensible."

Then Chambers replied:

"When I was a Communist, I had three heroes. One was a Russian. One was a Pole. One was a German Jew.

"The Pole was ascetic, highly sensitive, intelligent. He was a Communist. After the Russian revolution, he became head of the Tcheka and organizer of the Red terror.

"As a young man he had been a political prisoner * * *. There he insisted on being given the task of cleaning the latrines of the other prisoners. For he held that the most developed member of any community must take upon himself the lowliest tasks as an example to those who are less developed. That is one thing that it meant to be a Communist.

"The German Jew was Eugen Levine. He was a Communist. During the Bavarian Soviet Republic in 1919, Levine was the organizer of the Workers and Soldiers Soviets. When the Bavarian Soviet Republic was crushed, Levine was captured and court-martialed.

"The court-martial told him: 'You are under sentence of death.' Levine answered: 'We Communists are always under sentence of death.' That is another thing it meant to be a Communist.

"The Russian was not a Communist. He was a pre-Communist, arrested for a minor part in the assassination of the Czarist Prime Minister, Von Plehve. He was sent into Siberian exile to one of the worst prison camps, where the political prisoners were flogged. (He) sought some way to protest this outrage to the world.

"The means were few, but at last he found a way. In protest against the flogging of

other men, Kalyaev drenched himself in kerosene, set himself on fire and burned himself to death. That also is what it meant to be a Communist."

Sacrifice, dedication, bravery; these are the levers the Communists have used to move the world. And they are the conditions still demanded of loyal Communists.

Most Communist guides, students, and officials I met behind the Iron Curtain proudly stressed the fact that they are helping to build a better future, and that hardship and sacrifice are not to be pitied or deplored, but are the ingredients necessary for purifying their efforts.

Let the West be content with its color television sets, its fancy cars, its stylish clothes; for themselves, these Communists have a world to win, after which they can worry about material comforts.

This does not mean that a Communist society can altogether afford to ignore its citizens' demands for more; Khrushchev's recent wheat transaction with Canada, and the small but significant concessions granted in the satellite nations, indicate otherwise.

But it does demonstrate what loyal Communists have said all along—that they are less interested in filling someone's stomach than in capturing his mind.

For they understand that Communist man does not live by bread alone, therefore, they feel certain they can keep him in line with the spiritual nourishment of Marxism-Leninism.

The saddest memory from my travels behind the Iron Curtain is of the youngsters, not because most of them will never know coke or hot dogs, lipstick or high heels, transistors or hi-fi's, but because as long as they live under communism they will never hear mention of God, except disdainfully or disparagingly.

And because they will never be exposed to the ideas or thoughts of the Western tradition, except as those ideas and thoughts are twisted and run through a Marxist ideological wringer in order that they will come out 99 and 44/100 percent pure.

And because all their exposure to education—and make no mistake, the Communists place great stress on education—will be for the sake of shaping them into obedient, devoted Communists.

All available evidence indicates that the Communist bloc has made impressive economic gains, particularly in areas of steel production, heavy industry, and armaments, where they have concentrated their efforts and manpower.

The only relevant question, therefore, is whether they could have made equally impressive gains without adopting, as instruments of state policy, those dreaded midnight knocks on the door, kangaroo courts, and brainwashing.

Would it not have been possible for them to have achieved the same living standards without distorting and rewriting history, without outlawing opposition political parties, and without erecting walls and barbed wire fences against the outside world?

The question was best answered by Walt W. Rostow, chief State Department policy planner, who in a recent speech said the economies of the NATO countries are growing faster than the economies of the Communist bloc.

"Only a few years back," Rostow said, "it was common to believe that, whatever their demerits, Communist societies had the capacity to sustain much higher rates of growth than societies based on human freedom. This is a proposition which can no longer be scientifically maintained."

Whether it can be scientifically maintained or not, no one I spoke with behind the Iron Curtain, Communist or non-Communist, expects the Reds to alter drastically their

approach. These observers hope for a genuine thaw on the part of the Communists, and many believe it will occur before "shrimp learn to whistle," as Khrushchev once put it. But they do not expect it to happen, except perhaps gradually, in the foreseeable future.

And what of the future?

No one can say, least of all a first-time visitor.

But if communism is indeed the wave of the future, as I was reminded during my travels through the satellite nations, I'm afraid that what I saw of it during my visit will cause me to join those who, to paraphrase Lenin, will have to be dragged screaming into the future.

FOREIGN AID AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 14, I was privileged to deliver one of a series of lectures sponsored by the Department of Agriculture Graduate School in Washington.

I was impressed by the interest and support expressed for this series. Approximately 750 of the top administrative and technical personnel of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development attended this lecture.

This was an appropriate opportunity to emphasize an aspect of our international programs which does not receive the attention it deserves.

I speak of our Nation's efforts to help develop the human resources of the developing nations.

It is not enough for us to stimulate the development of the natural and physical resources of countries which are struggling for progress. We have learned by experience that a nation cannot succeed in its efforts for economic and social progress unless it has skilled administrators for its government and pools of managerial and supervisory talent for the private sector of its society.

My prepared remarks for the Department of Agriculture Graduate School lecture detailed the needs for trained public administrators in the underdeveloped nations. In addition, I stressed in extemporaneous comments that we must increase our efforts to increase the numbers of skilled managers and supervisors in the nongovernmental sectors of these nations. Our own talented leaders of business, labor, and the cooperative movement must be challenged to share their skills with the citizens of the underdeveloped nations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts of my remarks at the Department of Agriculture Graduate School.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: THE U.S. APPROACH

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Department of Agriculture Graduate School, November 14, 1963)

I have traveled hundreds of thousands of miles as a U.S. Senator trying to measure, evaluate, and understand the reason why so many people in the world continue to live in abject poverty, and why there continues to be so much political instability. Why does democracy seem to have such a hard time raising its head? And, why is it so

short-lived? Why does it so frequently succumb to dictatorships and military juntas?

Is there some basic flaw in the societies of Latin America, Asia, and Africa? I cannot believe it. There is no basic flaw in the people. People everywhere have the same hopes and dreams as you and I. They want freedom, just as we do. They are willing to work and sacrifice to get ahead.

Their idealists and their visionaries have caught their imaginations in these new nations. Sometimes they have mustered enough strength to overthrow the ancient tyrannies, and try democracy. But all too often, visions fade in the vacuum of administrative incompetence. A handful of doctors, lawyers, or college professors cannot cope with the raw and angry problems of a people who demand more than they have had. Regularly, tragically, the dreamers are bogged down or are pulled down. The dreary cycle of incompetence, corruption and final violence is again repeated. Typically, democratic experiments are replaced by military coups. Why? It is not solely because the military have the guns. Too often the officer corps is the only group in an underdeveloped nation that is trained in administration.

One of the great tragedies in the developing nations is that there are so very few non-military personnel who have the necessary training and motivation to enter Government service. By default, juntas come to power and stay in power through a failure of democratic leaders to govern efficiently.

The debate on foreign aid which has occupied the Senate for the past several weeks, gives a sharp focus to the discussion today on "Public Administration in Developing Countries: The U.S. Approach." Many people have been frustrated with our foreign aid program. The problems are inherently complex. They involve issues of foreign policy, domestic and international economics, and problems of national security. Our capacity to grasp and administer the problems is compounded by the tremendous variety in the nature of the problems and needs among the different countries.

There is a broad range of conditions. At one end we have countries just emerging from primitive societies. At the other, some will soon take their places among developed nations. To the different stages of economic development we must add the overlay of different languages, religions, cultural patterns, and different political traditions.

Iran has centuries of Persian tradition. Some new African states have a national identity only several years old. Some countries have few high school graduates. Others had distinguished universities before America was discovered. Some countries have vast natural resources. In others, a slim living is eeked from soil still scratched with a pointed stick. A thousand variations make it difficult to grasp the foreign aid program and make it difficult for the State Department and AID to administer with the ball-bearing smoothness some people very unrealistically expect.

One problem is present everywhere: every country has serious deficiencies in public administration. It is difficult to "get things done" through Government. There is a shortage of trained managerial talent. There are inadequate fiscal and economic institutions geared to the needs of the Government; inadequate services to the public, particularly the smaller rural areas; and lack of enough modern training institutions to produce skilled public employees.

We can't push a button and improve public administration in 60 countries. We know at home that good administration does not come overnight and it does not come by decree. Furthermore, what fits our American democratic heritage often does not fit countries where government must base itself upon tribal structure, or colonies with an inherited tradition from British or French

civil service. In Latin America, the Spanish heritage, military tradition, and the Napoleonic code modify in various ways the structural ideas of the American Government.

In our policies, we recognize this. For 12 years, AID and its predecessor agencies in our Government, and the United Nations have given limited technical assistance in the field of public administration. Before that the Census Bureau extended training and advisory service which helped make a success of the 1950 census of the Americas. The Bureau of the Budget trained some foreign nationals as early as 1947.

This kind of technical assistance has continued in terms of training, institution building, and advisory services.

In recent years we have trained 500-800 people per year from 60 countries, in various skills of public administration. In most cases nationals with some command of English have come to the United States for 6 months to a year. Training combines some specialized courses with observation and work experience in Federal, State, or local government offices.

This has been valuable. It could not possibly reach enough people, however, to make possible rapid improvement in administration in many countries. Therefore a new approach stresses group training of the participants in their own language. In the past year 30 Chileans have been trained in tax collection and administration, in Spanish. Our host here today, the graduate school of the Department of Agriculture, has trained several groups of Congolese, in French. The Alliance for Progress has stepped up the use of Puerto Rico in training Latin Americans.

Training 1,000 or even 10,000 individuals per year in the United States would not be enough to meet the manpower needs of these countries. Think of a country with one lawyer, one personnel man, or just one agricultural agent—who has never driven a tractor or made an important decision. Further training in the United States can be costly, and possibly totally unsuited to the needs of the foreign country. There is no point in having a tax official study the use of our computers if his country is just moving from the abacus to the adding machine. Rather we must build up educational and training institutions abroad, adapted to local needs. Our major resources now go in this way.

An early example was the Institute of Public Administration of the Philippines. The University of Michigan collaborated here. As it grew, U.S. assistance was discontinued. Filipinos man this center now entirely. They train their own people to serve their Government, as well as officials from other countries in the Far East. Michigan State University has helped Brazil set up a school of business. A full Brazilian faculty of 25 gives a 4-year course. A thousand key business executives have been trained.

Some of the greatest needs are for training below the university level. The Alliance for Progress has stressed this. Chile has now a tax training school—375 Chileans have received intensive training, the first time any Latin American revenue personnel have participated in planned, organized, and full-time training. In Guatemala and Paraguay a total of 1,000 public employees per year are trained. In Peru, the Institute of Public Administration of New York assists a major program in the Peruvian Institute of Public Administration.

In all, the United States supports 37 training institutions abroad in public and business administration and economics. Twenty-one of these are operating under the Alliance for Progress. I want to emphasize too that other organizations than the U.S. Government are encouraged to share the load. The Ford Foundation helps in Colombia and Venezuela. The United Nations is giving increasing attention to the emerging countries of Africa.

We are also stressing direct advisory services to foreign governments. Not all American technicians are men in field clothes advising farmers, or nurses showing mothers how to bathe babies. Some 300 Americans, from the U.S. Government, private consulting firms, and universities are working with governments. They are not writing surveys and reports. They are working at modernizing government programs.

Last year Americans helped Jordan install a new budget system. This year they established a new accounting system. In Chile, personnel from our Internal Revenue helped reorganize their internal revenue system: streamlining procedures, writing manuals, decentralizing activity. In Taiwan, fiscal reform is well underway. Automatic data processing there has put some taxes on computers and prepares lists in days that once took years. Daily posting of receipts and disbursements is done by IBM machines. Program and performance budgeting is becoming standard in all agencies. In Panama, Americans have established a well-organized staff office to the President—who can now get top-level advice in planning, budgeting, personnel, and administrative management.

There is no question that administrative progress has been made in the last 10 years. But we have a long way to go in completing the day-to-day administrative improvements which are essential for economic and social development. Waste and inefficiency continues—far more than either the American taxpayers or the developing countries can afford. We have made progress in the mechanics of administration. We now must attack more intangible and difficult political problems—the problems of decisionmaking at the policy level.

The political problem in administrative modernization can be framed in three questions:

1. How can we convince the have-not nations of the urgency of administrative reform?

2. How can the machinery of government be adapted to cope with and assist in rapid and constructive social and economic change?

3. How does one get the mechanism of government to be effective outside the capital cities—in the rural areas?

These are formidable problems. Let me elaborate on them.

It is not easy to define and harder to create a sense of urgency regarding administrative reform. This is often true in the United States, even when we have a reform tradition. It is doubly difficult in countries where there is no such tradition.

Administrative reform must come from within. Reform is substantially a political process. Outsiders can give technical help; but are severely restricted if they try to move beyond that point.

We can do some things to help create a climate and a will. The Alliance for Progress has illustrated some ways to get things moving. Before the Alliance, tax advisers usually just wrote reports which gathered dust in the archives. At Punta del Este, however, the Charter focused on tax reform. The President stressed it. Officials like Teodoro Moscoso stressed it. Our missions and Embassies talked it. It became an important item for discussion in the press. Taxation still isn't fashionable in most of Latin America, but the problem is off dead center. It is being discussed, legislation has been enacted, administrative practices are changing and collections are rising.

Ecuador provides an example of a different approach to administrative reform. We have loaned Ecuador substantial sums for budgetary support and some high priority programs. To make sure they worked, Ecuador got a loan of \$1.6 million from AID specifically for administrative and fiscal reform. They are using the money well to this end.

In this way both foreign and domestic resources are being mobilized to bring about substantial reforms of a basic character.

It is very important indeed to improve the machinery of government. This can still leave the government impersonal, however. Millions of pesos may be saved by a better budget system, but this may not get milk to babies. Better administration must contribute directly and immediately to better public services that people can see, feel, and identify with.

This is a major problem for us all over the world. Economists can and have made workable plans. Engineers have detailed feasibility projects. Often these are not developed, because countries lack the administrative skills to carry them out. How, for example, does one get agrarian reform or any major economic or social program going where an official government workweek is 28 hours, or where government employees must hold down two or three jobs to make an adequate living?

There is a long way to go. There needs to be more urgency for administrative reform. Administration must institute practical programs in the service of people. The machinery of Government must get out into the rural and outlying areas. In saying that progress has been made, I am not denying that there is a long way to go.

Most governmental machinery in developing countries is geared to a normal time and pace that is completely out of date. In most cases the institutions do not even exist that can respond to current needs with the urgency required.

I believe we need some new ideas in recruiting in public administration. We must find ways to team up experts in agriculture, education, and administration. We can make better use of talent in other agencies of our government, Federal, State, and local. Through multilateral agencies, more use can be made of the experience of foreign countries in creating institutions needed by the developing ones. Our own universities can do more thinking about administrative institutions abroad.

Even more complex than recruiting personnel, however, is the problem of extending good government outside of the capital cities. Most developing countries have a tradition of centralization. Seldom is there a deep philosophy of public service. Able people leave small communities of limited opportunity to seek the advantages of the capital. Officials are reluctant to delegate authority to those who may not exercise it properly. Regardless of the difficulties of conditions however, unless public services get to the people in rural areas, economic and social development is not successful.

At this point the work of the Peace Corps should be mentioned. This is precisely what Peace Corpsmen—and women—do. They get out into the rural areas, the primitive villages, and work. The best of American youth show a willingness to roll up their sleeves and serve the rural people. That is not a tradition in many countries where youth of similar families and status get away as fast as possible to the cities of opportunity. Apart from the value of the projects they develop, this example of the Peace Corps may yet be one of the most effective tools in helping us crack this problem.

How does one get rural development going, if buying a shovel has to be approved in a capital 500 miles away? How does one plan land without maps? How does one develop agricultural production with few clear property titles? When no one below the Cabinet level can coordinate anything or even tell local specialists to get together and talk over problems, it is hard to get anything moving. All decisions cannot be made at the top.

Facing up to these problems, we have shifted our emphasis in public administra-

tion in two ways from our technical assistance approach of earlier years:

First, we tailor our assistance to the overall development plan of a country, rather than to do a good, but isolated project. This is our emphasis particularly in Latin America. We are trying to help reshape the economies and societies of the member nations through a concerted attack on outmoded patterns of life and government.

Secondly, we are trying to make the skills we teach last and endure. We do not wish just to demonstrate a better way of doing things and hope that something will stick. We are trying to build our skills permanently into new and reformed institutions to carry them on.

We are also trying to develop these skills by creating institutions suited to the particular country's needs, special characteristics, and national aspirations. There is no use building tight islands of foreign efficiency that are expected somehow (perhaps by osmosis) to be absorbed by the natives. You have to have specific training programs worked out.

We have much to learn from the countries in which we work. We must establish confidence and effective working relationships with people in all these differing countries and I emphasize their difference. This takes time. But it is time we have to take if our efforts are to be meaningful and successful in getting at the roots of the public administration problems.

It will take time, therefore, for important improvements in public administration to be made. When they are, they can have a profound and lasting effect on the societies, the political structures, and the economies of the developing countries.

It is then that Americans will perhaps acknowledge the service of those in their leadership—in the executive and legislative branches—who fought off shortsighted attempts to prevent the spending of a few cents per American citizen, for so vital a purpose in the development of a modern free world.

ON-THE-FARM STORAGE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, there is a very brief paragraph in the current issue of *Washington Farmletter*—November 16, 1963—on grain storage which reads:

They're talking at USDA about saying goodbye next year to resale programs for farmers on grain storage.

The article explains that because of tight storage situations which existed when our surpluses were mounting in the fifties, the Department initiated resale programs to encourage the provision of storage on the farms.

Now that Commodity Credit Corporation holdings are declining, the grain can all be accommodated off the farms.

Many farmers in South Dakota and elsewhere invested in storage facilities to accommodate the Government when storage was short. The investment of these farmers in storage is entitled to as much consideration as the investment of others.

I serve notice to those who are talking of ending resale programs that I shall protest any such action as vigorously as I can, and that I expect to be only one of a large number of Senators and Representatives doing so.

ECONOMIC CONVERSION ACT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the highly respected columnist, Mr. Marquis

Childs, has written a thoughtful column on the theme "Too Many Arms, Too Few Brains."

Mr. Childs discusses the drain on our civilian economy resulting from the heavy concentration of research and development in arms spending. He also refers to legislation which I have recently introduced to ease the transition from arms production to civilian production.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Childs' article which appears in the Washington Post of today be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO MANY ARMS, TOO FEW BRAINS
(By Marquis Childs)

With a presidential year just ahead, it is a safe bet that the rallying cry, "Elect me because I can do more for the great State of * * *," is certain to resound across the land. The eager officeseeker will give the impression that defense contracts, research contracts, projects large and small, are on the political auction block and he and he alone can snare them.

Defense spending takes today 10 percent of the Nation's gross national product. This means that whole communities and large payrolls depend on a continuous flow of dollars from Washington.

A program put forward recently to help ease the adjustment from a cold war economy to a future peacetime economy went almost unnoticed. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, Democrat, of South Dakota, joined by 10 others including Majority Whip HUBERT HUMPHREY, proposed a national economic conversion commission. The commission would be responsible for drafting a blueprint for converting to peacetime work and for drawing up schedules of possible private and public investment that would help to bridge the transition period. All plants in which 25 percent of operation was in defense would be required to set up an operating conversion committee.

In presenting his proposal to the Senate, MCGOVERN quoted in support of it from an eminently respectable source, a survey of the Morgan Guaranty Bank:

"With about one-tenth of gross national product devoted to military purposes year after year, there has developed a reluctance, both public and private, toward cutting back so sizable a sector of economic activity. Thus, the very fact that makes it important to prepare for the possibility of a reduction in defense outlays—that is, the economy's heavy involvement in defense—could also make it more difficult to achieve reduction."

MCGOVERN uttered a warning similar to that which has long been coming from business. The fact that roughly three-fourths of the Nation's scientific and engineering talent is in military research and development or space has caused a drastic decline in the modernization of civilian industries. The United States, which once led the world in machine-tool production, today has slipped to fourth or fifth place, according to MCGOVERN.

The concentration of research in the Government sector means that this country has lagged behind in new and improved products. In West Germany only 5 to 10 percent of research is in defense and the balance in private industry.

What this means in world competition in the sale of goods and services hardly needs to be pointed out. The relation to America's unfavorable balance of payments is a direct one. As West Germany, Japan, and Italy have built up new plants, the United States is left today with the unenviable distinction of operating the most outdated

metalworking machinery of any major industrial power.

The Wall Street Journal last summer conducted a survey revealing that industrialists felt that high defense and space research salaries paid out of seemingly unlimited funds had priced them out of the market. Between 1954 and 1961 personnel working on Government research contracts rose 317 percent to 190,000. In this same period industry increased its private research payroll only 30 percent to 130,000.

As the demand for technical manpower grows, the supply dwindles. According to the Wall Street Journal survey, the demand for new engineers alone now runs close to 60,000 a year. But in the current calendar year only about 33,700 will be graduated and this is down from 38,134 in 1959. The situation seems to be nearly as acute in the physical sciences, chemistry, and physics.

This is, of course, only one aspect of the cold war economy where adjustments are vital if trouble is avoided. MCGOVERN pointed out that in the aircraft industry over 93 percent of all employees are working on warplanes. In shipbuilding the figure is 60 percent, in radio and communications equipment, 38 percent. Unless these industries are to go on into an indefinite future, turning out more and more war machines to be stockpiled, a basic adjustment will have to be faced up to.

A horrible example of how not to succeed by hardly trying at all is in stockpiling. There, because of the pressure of private interests, the Government acquired mountains of material far beyond any foreseeable use. To repeat that on a far larger scale in armaments would be the height of folly.

REORGANIZATION OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION—A SHORT STEP TOWARD IMPROVED SCIENTIFIC PROGRAMS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on November 2, 1963, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony Celebrezze, announced an important step in strengthening one of the vital components of that great Department, the Food and Drug Administration. The Secretary announced the FDA's long-awaited reorganization plan.

The new structure is based, in part, on recommendations submitted in October 1962 by the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the FDA. That advisory group had been appointed by Secretary Celebrezze's distinguished predecessor, the Honorable ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, now the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut.

In a public statement released on Monday of this week, I was happy to commend the Food and Drug Administration reorganization plan as a constructive step forward. The plan will enable the FDA to serve the public health more effectively.

At the same time, I pointed out very frankly that, as the FDA itself must be aware, this plan represents only a modest step forward. Giant strides are necessary in order to have the FDA gain the scientific stature of, say, the National Institutes of Health.

INVITATION FOR DEPARTMENT'S COMMENT

For this reason, I have asked the Special Assistant to the Secretary for Health and Medical Affairs, who has been handling FDA problems, Mr. B. Jones, to furnish a statement of what I hope will

be bold and comprehensive plans to upgrade science further in the FDA.

This statement would be furnished to the Senate Government Operations Committee's Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, of which I am chairman. This subcommittee has been studying interagency drug issues, particularly the problems of the Food and Drug Administration.

The subcommittee has compiled expert judgment from scientists throughout the United States by means of an extensive program of correspondence, over and above our formal hearings.

Our final drug hearings will be held prior to January 31, 1964, as set forth under our current authority, Senate Resolution 27, 88th Congress, 1st session, providing for study of interagency coordination.

THREE SETS OF BACKGROUND MATERIALS

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of Secretary Celebrezze's helpful public statement of November 2; my own statement of November 11; and excerpts from comments by one of the many trade publications which during the past year have discussed the Food and Drug Administration reorganization. This is the publication Food Chemical News.

There being no objection, the statement and excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY HEW

A reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration was announced today by Anthony J. Celebrezze, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The reorganization adopts salient features from recommendations of the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the Food and Drug Administration, which made its report in October 1962.

In making the announcement, Secretary Celebrezze said:

"An important feature of the reorganization is the upgrading of the scientific functions. I expect the reorganization to improve FDA operations all along the line, and thereby provide more effective protection of the consumers' interests."

"The reorganization will not entail the expenditure of additional funds. It adjusts existing functions and deploys the staff so that they will be able to operate more efficiently," the Secretary said.

George P. Larrick, Commissioner of Food and Drugs, made the following comment:

"The plan which has been approved by Secretary Celebrezze has been designed to modernize the structure of the Food and Drug Administration in the light of its new and growing responsibilities. It is a foundation for progressive strengthening of consumer protection in regard to foods, drugs, medical devices, cosmetics, and household chemical products over the next 10 years."

An important feature of the reorganization will be the appointment of a National Advisory Council to the Food and Drug Administration comprised of representative citizens under the chairmanship of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs. It will advise the administration on national needs and the effectiveness of program policies.

A new associate commissioner, who will be a scientist, will give leadership from the Office of the Commissioner to the programs and functions having to do with medicine, science, and research.

Two new bureaus with scientific activities are established—a Bureau of Scientific Research, supporting FDA's basic mission of

consumer protection, and a Bureau of Scientific Standards and Evaluation, which will handle safety clearance functions in regard to pesticides, food additives and colors, and develop scientific data to be used in setting standards and tolerances. These Bureaus replace the present Bureau of Biological and Physical Sciences.

No change is contemplated in the present Bureau of Medicine, which has recently been reorganized to handle new responsibilities under the Kefauver-Harris Drug Amendments of 1962.

Enforcement activities will be consolidated in a single Bureau of Regulatory Compliance replacing in part the Bureau of Field Administration and the Bureau of Enforcement, which presently have divided enforcement responsibilities.

Educational functions of the Food and Drug Administration are emphasized in the creation of a new Bureau of Education and Voluntary Compliance. This will include the Division of Advisory Opinions, formerly in the Bureau of Enforcement, which answers industry inquiries on compliance problems. The bureau will also include the industry education branch, and the consumer education branch and consumer inquiries section from the present Division of Public Information, and the consumer consultant program now in the Office of the Commissioner. Press and public information services will be carried on by a new Office of Public Information.

All positions involved in the reorganization are in the career Civil Service. The following list released by Commissioner Larrick shows the organization units and top personnel of the Food and Drug Administration as they will be under the new plan:

Commissioner of Food and Drugs: George P. Larrick.

Deputy Commissioner: John L. Harvey.

Associate Commissioner: To be appointed.

Special Assistant to the Commissioner for National Advisory Council and Special Projects: Dr. Kenneth L. Milstead.

Office of Public Information: W. F. Janssen, Director.

Office of Federal State Relations: James C. Pearson, Director.

Office of Emergency Preparedness: Dr. H. G. Underwood, Director.

Assistant Commissioner for Planning: Winton B. Rankin.

Assistant Commissioner for Science Resources: Dr. O. L. Kline.

Assistant Commissioner for Regulations: Malcolm R. Stephens.

Assistant Commissioner for Operations: J. Kenneth Kirk.

Assistant Commissioner for Administration: Leo L. Miller.

Bureau of Medicine: Director to be appointed; Acting Director Ralph G. Smith, M.D.

Bureau of Scientific Research: Director to be appointed; Deputy Director, Dr. Daniel Baner.

Bureau of Scientific Standards & Evaluation: R. S. Roe, Director.

Bureau of Regulatory Compliance: Allan E. Rayfield, Director.

Bureau of Education and Voluntary Compliance: Director to be appointed; Deputy Director, Shelby T. Grey.

SENATOR HUMPHREY ASKS FOR BOLD FDA SCIENCE PROGRAM FOR THE SIXTIES

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, has asked the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to present a concrete program to upgrade science in the sixties in the Food and Drug Administration.

A bold program is necessary to fill in the modest plan which recently reorganized the agency, HUMPHREY said.

The reorganization plan, he continued, is a helpful, forward step, but it is far too

short to meet FDA's science needs in the biochemical age.

The Minnesota Senator is chairman of a Senate Government Operations Subcommittee, which has been studying Federal drug policies.

He addressed his request to Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has been handling FDA problems.

Senator HUMPHREY said FDA's reorganization will "definitely serve consumer interests, as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze has soundly stated."

But, HUMPHREY continued, the scientific elements in the plan are only a shadow of what was recommended 13 months ago by the Second Citizens Advisory Committee on the Agency.

The plan's failure to establish a strong, independent Food and Drugs Institute or its equivalent "is the greatest single disappointment," HUMPHREY said.

"Comparatively little is accomplished by mere establishment of a new post of Associate Commissioner for Science or by retitling and shuffling certain other science units," he said.

HUMPHREY expressed continuing confidence in Secretary Celebrezze whom he termed a vigorous, able administrator. "The Secretary knows that it takes people, resources, and programs to fill in what any organization chart may promise," HUMPHREY said.

FDA, he continued, "is to be commended for recent improvements." "The agency, which has long been an orphan in Federal science support, is now experiencing natural growing pains, in order to fulfill complex requirements under the Kefauver-Harris drug law and new regulations."

"The problem is, however, that the food, drug and cosmetic industries are so dynamic and are in such a scientific revolution that FDA can't keep up with them."

"It isn't fair to FDA, to the regulated industries or to the public if the Agency has less than the best in scientific plans, personnel, salaries, equipment, and relationships with the scientific community."

He cited as an example the need for close FDA "teamwork with new and expanded university departments of clinical pharmacology in teaching hospitals throughout the country." This requires a "two-way flow of ideas, experiences, and manpower," he said. FDA must "become more than a mere regulatory agency with a few scientific activities. It must become a regulatory-scientific agency with a stature as high as that of the National Institutes of Health." It is not going to gain NIH's reputation, he said, "by a game of 'musical chairs' or by merely inventing new titles on its stationery or on office doors."

"It is a little difficult," he said, "to figure out why it took 13 months to come up with so limited a reorganization proposal."

A National Advisory Council to the Agency still has not been appointed, although it has been recommended by authorities for not less than 5 years, he noted.

In addition, specialized advisory panels should long since have been established. Such panels would consist of the foremost experts in the land in major medical specialties like pediatric, cardio-vascular, and psychiatric drugs.

He added a note of caution, however. "Some people would apparently like to set some senior panel up over FDA and stack the panel. Their hope is apparently to have the panel then exercise a veto over any of FDA's drug decisions which self-interest groups don't like."

"Consider what could have happened under such circumstances in the case of the baby-deforming drug, thalidomide. If the

company could have gone over the head of Dr. Frances Kelsey, it might have pressured some weak panel into requesting her to release the drug. The result could have been tragic," HUMPHREY said.

"There is no substitute for strength and excellence in regulatory scientific personnel," he continued. "Such personnel should be ready and willing to consider the best advice available, but they must not be pressured into sacrificing the public's interest to the demands of some self-interest group."

"Excessive fear or arbitrary pressure can have the harmful result of blocking the release of a truly valuable drug," he concluded. "By contrast, an attitude of recklessness or arbitrary pressure could result in the opposite—in the needless releasing of a drug whose dangers outweigh its advantages."

"A middle ground is needed. It can only be attained if FDA becomes a part of the mainstream of scientific excellence. That goal is yet to be achieved."

[From Food Chemical News, Sept. 3, 1962]

MOUNTING CRITICISM OF FDA POINTS UP REORGANIZATION NEED

Recent criticism of the Food and Drug Administration, both on the floor of the Senate and in the public press, point up the need for a long-overdue reorganization of the agency.

An administrative reorganization of FDA is needed because its organization has not kept up with its vastly expanded size. One or two men can no longer make all the decisions.

[From Food Chemical News, Dec. 3, 1962]

FDA-INDUSTRY COOPERATION, VOLUNTARY COMPLIANCE IS MAJOR THEME AT FLI; JONES CONFIRMS THAT CAC REPORT WILL BE USED AS GUIDE

The Food and Drug Administration and regulated industries had a 1-day sweetness and light session last week in Washington, as the annual Food Law Institute-FDA conference hit a peak of undramatic togetherness.

The CAC report was, of course, the chief topic of interest at the FLI meeting, and HEW's Boisfeuillet Jones made his first public statements on the report at the annual FLI banquet. Jones, special assistant for health matters, has emerged as the key man in implementation of the CAC report. In his speech, he confirmed that the report will be used as a mandate for a reorganization of FDA, but that the actual changes will be worked out by FDA's and Jones (see Food Chemical News, Nov. 5, p. 12).

CAC RECOMMENDATIONS WILL NOT BE FOLLOWED TO THE LETTER

Jones made it clear that the CAC report will be used as a guide rather than a detailed map, saying, "Obviously we will not follow the letter of all recommendations." He explained that, "It is understood—and the report clearly stated—that specific recommendations were intended to be illustrative rather than definitive."

An overall reorganization for FDA "is timely and necessary," Jones said, although he commented that it would not be accomplished "precisely as set forth in the report." He revealed that "such reorganization planning is actively underway."

The CAC's comment that FDA's scientific programs should be strengthened, Jones said, is "valid." He added: "Just how this is to be done is not yet clear. That it will be done, however, is certain." The CAC had urged splitting off FDA's scientific work into a Food and Drug Institute. It is believed that FDA will upgrade its scientists without taking such a drastic step.

[From Food Chemical News, Feb. 11, 1963]
WHAT HAPPENED TO THE REORGANIZATION OF
FDA?

In October, the Citizens Advisory Committee called for a top-to-bottom reorganization of the Food and Drug Administration. In November, Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was given chief responsibility for the FDA reorganization. HEW set a January 1 deadline for the reorganization plan—with the implication that something should be done by the time Congress reconvened.

FDA's New Drug Division was reorganized (see Food Chemical News, Dec. 24, p. 5), just in time to satisfy drug-conscious Members of Congress as they returned to Washington. But there has been no further action.

It had appeared that "Bo" Jones had shrouded his work in secrecy. The suspicion is now growing that there is nothing to be secretive about, that little has been done.

Around HEW, it is pointed out that the reorganization of FDA is a complex matter, that Jones does not have a large staff to assist him, that FDA is not the only matter requiring attention from Jones.

The fact remains, however, that Jones had discussed reorganization with FDA Commissioner Larrick even before issuance of the CAC report (see Food Chemical News, Nov. 5, p. 12). Since the CAC recommendation for a complete reorganization (see Food Chemical News, Oct. 29, p. 13), FDA has sent a reorganization plan to Jones' desk. He also has before him the reorganization plan contained in the CAC report, plus reorganization ideas from another HEW top-sider.

FDA MORALE SLIPS IN ERA OF UNCERTAINTY

FDA is in need of a reorganization (see Food Chemical News, Sept. 3, p. 5). As a matter of fact, Larrick requested appointment of the CAC to gain a mandate to justify reorganization.

However, there was no great rush about a reorganization. The programed changes would have permitted an agency doing a good job, by and large, to do a better job. The need for the reorganization became pressing only when HEW responded to the CAC report by promising a quick reorganization of FDA.

Failure to keep this promise has resulted in a period of uncertainty and low morale for FDA'ers, who do not know what their positions will be after the reorganization.

[From Food Chemical News, Apr. 15, 1963]

Boisfeuillet Jones, special assistant to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Celebrezze, told Food Chemical News last week he believes part of the plans for FDA's reorganization will be disclosed at the hearings at which he will be one of the key witnesses.

Enough progress has been made, he said, to be able to give some of the details of the reorganization if questions on the subject are posed by ROBERTS' House subcommittee. "We're moving along very nicely," he said, adding: "I think we've made progress." Jones said many pieces need to be put together before final plans can be formulated.

[From Food Chemical News, Sept. 9, 1963]

"Bo" JONES IS EXPECTED TO REVEAL DETAILS
OF FDA REORGANIZATION

After months of delay and secrecy, Boisfeuillet Jones, special Health, Education, and Welfare Department assistant for health and medical affairs, will reveal shortly his plans for reorganizing the Food and Drug Administration.

The plan will be unveiled before Senator HUMPHREY's Reorganizations Subcommittee at 2 days of hearings, which have been tentatively scheduled for Wednesday and

Thursday, September 11 and 12, but may be put off until a later date because of conflicts on the Senator's schedule.

Jones promised the plans of the reorganization within 3 to 6 months when testifying before a House Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee in the spring (see Food Chemical News, May 20, p. 7). He testified nearly 4 months ago that the major recommendations of FDA's Citizens Advisory Committee report, including the establishment of a Food and Drug Institute as well as a Food and Drug National Advisory Council, would be adopted in his reorganization.

COMMENDATION OF SECRETARY CELEBREZZE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it should be mentioned that this and other industry and trade publications have been concerned, as have been congressional sources, over delays in this reorganization effort.

We well realize, of course, the many other legislative issues which have had to receive Secretary Celebrezze's personal attention during the past crowded year.

I want it quite clear that I have a high regard for Secretary Celebrezze. He is an able and vigorous administrator. Necessarily, in that vast, complex Department, he has had to delegate many issues to other offices, as in this particular instance.

Mr. President, I also wish to call to the attention of the Senate the proposal we have made in the committee for further advances by and the improvement of the Food and Drug Administration. This agency does not seem to be one of the Government agencies which arouse much public attention; but it is a very important agency, particularly in connection with the new Drug Act, the Kefauver-Harris Act, of last year. The Food and Drug Administration has very great responsibilities in connection with the public health and the public safety. It needs more attention from Congress and more scientific personnel and better facilities with which to conduct its work.

I have often been critical of many of the procedures and decisions of the Food and Drug Administration, but I must also be critical of Congress. Congress has not provided this agency with the necessary manpower, salary schedule, scientific personnel, and technical staff and the facilities needed to enable it to do effective work as a scientific agency of the Government. The Food and Drug Administration is both a police-power agency—for it polices food and drug products and examines their purity, efficacy and therapeutic value. It also is an important research agency, conducting research in regard to new drugs and studies of their application, all of which are extremely important in connection with the public health.

Therefore, I am very happy that my statement of several weeks ago will be looked upon, not as a critical one, but as one encouraging this agency to do even more than it has done.

The Citizens Advisory Committee made some very constructive proposals. Some of them have been adopted in the reorganization plan, and others await action. I encourage both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and Mr. George Larrick, the Food and Drug Administrator, to give special attention to the other recommendations. We can-

not afford to settle for second best in dealing with the reorganization and improvement of the Food and Drug Administration.

Our subcommittee will continue its hearings; and we hope to be able to present before the end of the year a rather thoughtful and, I trust, helpful summary of our activities.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS PROVISION IN THE BRACERO PROGRAM

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey, who today spoke to me privately in regard to the so-called bracero bill. I wish to commend him for his work on that bill, for the hearings he held in regard to it, and for the effective leadership he has given to the examination of this type of employment.

As I recall, he brought to our attention the fact that in passing the bracero bill the Senate adopted the McCarthy amendments; but the bill as it will come to us from the House of Representatives will include a House amendment striking out the amendments adopted by the Senate. Nevertheless, that bill authorizes a so-called public accommodations feature in this Government's agreement with Mexico which has been expressly approved, several times, by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

This program was enacted in 1951. Article 8 of the agreement with Mexico authorized by Public Law 78 is described as a prohibition against discrimination; and it reads in part as follows:

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry.

I believe it would be helpful to our debate on Wednesday to have the entire article 8 of the migrant labor agreement of 1951, printed at this point in the RECORD; and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE 8—PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mexican workers shall not be assigned to work nor permitted to remain in localities in which Mexicans are discriminated against because of their nationality or ancestry. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of this agreement and from time to time thereafter, the Mexican Ministry for Foreign Relations will furnish the Secretary of Labor a listing of the communities in which it considers that discrimination against Mexicans exists. If there is concurrence by the Secretary of Labor that there is such discrimination in any such area, he will not issue, or where appropriate will withdraw, the authorization provided for in article 10.

If the Secretary of Labor does not concur, the appropriate Mexican Consul may request a statement signed by the chief executive officer or officers of the chief law enforcement officer of the community in which the Mexican workers are to be employed, pledging for the community that:

(a) No discriminatory acts will be perpetrated against Mexicans in that locality; and

(b) In the event that the Mexican Consul reports the existence of acts of discrimination against any Mexican because of ancestry or nationality, the local governmental officers who signed the statement will have such complaints promptly investigated and take such community and individual action as may be necessary to fulfill the community pledge.

The Mexican Government will permit employment in such areas if such pledges are furnished.

If, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Mexican Consul reports that discriminatory acts have been committed against Mexicans because of their nationality or ancestry in a locality where Mexican workers are employed, the Mexican Consul having jurisdiction in the locality may request the representative of the Secretary of Labor to join the Mexican Consul in a joint investigation in which event the procedure prescribed in article 30 of this agreement will be followed.

EXPLANATORY NOTE.—The use of the word "authorization" is simply an editorial change to conform the language in this provision with the appropriate terminology contained in articles 1 and 10.)

*Joint interpretation and amendment of
March 1954*

The Government of Mexico will not include "counties" under article 8 of the agreement in the list of towns, communities, localities, and places where it is considered that discrimination exists against Mexicans on account of their nationality or of their ancestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. This program has been extended six times by very large votes—not regional votes, but from the south, east, and west. The public accommodations part of the legislation has thereby been approved six times by the full Congress. Let me say to those who feel that the public accommodations provisions in title II of the civil rights bill are unconstitutional that the Congress has given the lie to that argument by enacting this provision six times. It has been effective in many communities where there was discrimination because of Mexican nationality or ancestry. Under the provisions of the article, the authorities have gone in and have made swimming pools and other areas of public accommodations available to everyone—including Mexican nationals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Attorney General of the United States which discusses the analogy between public accommodations provisions authorized by Public Law 78 and the public accommodations provisions of the civil rights bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 23, 1963.

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have read with interest your letter of September 23, 1963, regarding article 8 of the migrant labor agreement between the United States and Mexico, entered into pursuant to the authority conferred by Public Law 78, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 119, 7 U.S.C. 1461 et. seq.). I agree with your suggestion that this statu-

tory program, which has been in effect for 12 years and affirmed by Congress on numerous occasions (67 Stat. 500; 69 Stat. 615; 72 Stat. 934; 74 Stat. 1021; 75 Stat. 761), has implications for the civil rights legislation which is now pending before the Congress.

It seems evident that those Members of Congress who voted in favor of continuing and extending this program saw no objection in principle to the use of governmental sanctions to prevent discrimination based on race or national origin in facilities that are open to the public. To the extent that they saw disadvantages in governmental action that would have the effect of compelling abandonment of discriminatory policies and practices, presumably they reasoned that such disadvantages were outweighed either by moral considerations or by the economic benefits to be gained from the program. Needless to say, I believe that similar moral and economic considerations not only justify but require enactment of the proposed civil rights legislation.

I appreciate very much your bringing this matter to my attention.

Sincerely,

Attorney General.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hold in my hand a copy of the speech made by the Senator from New Jersey on September 19, 1963, entitled, "What Is New About A Public Accommodations Law? Such a law has been on the books for 12 years, and expressly approved six times by the U.S. Senate."

The Senator points out that Public Law 78, which is the Mexican Labor Act, contains an antidiscrimination provision which has been enforced many times.

I should like to read a portion of the Senator's speech:

For instance, in Slaton, Tex., in the summer of 1960, the Labor Department investigated and found that there was discrimination at restaurants, bowling alleys, and the city swimming pool. At that time, the matter was satisfactorily concluded without the necessity of removing the Mexican nationals under contract in the area.

In the summer of 1961, a formal complaint was made alleging that the Slaton City swimming pool was being operated on a white-only basis and that American school children of Mexican ancestry—not merely Mexican nationals—were denied the use of the swimming pool. Negotiations with city officials followed the investigation in an effort to eliminate this discrimination.

The Mexican Government requested the immediate removal of all Mexicans working in the Slaton area. Through negotiations with Slaton city officials, the situation was eventually resolved in 1962 when the city of Slaton opened its swimming pool to all members of the public.

Then the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out:

It would appear that article 8 of Public Law 78 goes far beyond the public accommodation proposals in the President's civil rights legislation. Unlike the public accommodations provision of the civil rights bill, which only prohibits discrimination by businesses that affect interstate commerce, Pub-

lic Law 78 prohibits discrimination regardless of whether interstate commerce is involved.

The Senator from New Jersey has properly pointed out that if the public accommodations provisions of the bill (S. 1731) are unconstitutional, as some have claimed, it would seem clear that the nondiscrimination provisions in the agreement with Mexico authorized by Public Law 78 are equally unconstitutional, for under those provisions businessmen would not be allowed to discriminate among customers without being subject to governmental sanctions.

Furthermore, the Senator from New Jersey has pointed out—and I agree with him—that the sanctions authorized by Public Law 78 to prevent discrimination are even more severe than the sanctions under title II of the civil rights measure. Thus it seems to me that much of the hullabaloo and much of the skirmishing and arguing about public accommodations legislation is really rhetoric and is not based upon accepted public policy. Here we have a law that has been passed by the Congress several times. It is actively sponsored by able Members of this body. Yet that law authorizes prohibitions against any discrimination in public accommodations, whether they are private or public. Article 8 prohibits any discrimination in employment. It is a totally nondiscriminatory provision that has been authorized by the Congress of the United States.

It has been enacted in part because some people wanted that type of labor which they said they could not obtain in other parts of the Nation—even though I disagree with that conclusion. But the Mexican Government has insisted that its nationals be treated as human beings equal with any other human beings. The Mexican Government has demanded of the Congress and of the Government that its nationals be treated on a basis of full equality. If a foreign government can demand of our Government that its nationals be treated on the basis of equality in every type of facility that this country has within its boundaries, then why cannot the Government of the United States insist that all of its citizens be treated as equals, with full equality of treatment, accommodation and privilege in any facility in any part of the United States?

We are much indebted to the Senator from New Jersey for his splendid speech on September 19, 1963. The Senator's speech is in the RECORD. But I think that when we come to vote tomorrow, or whenever the vote takes place on the so-called bracero bill, we ought to know that in the past the bracero legislation has authorized a nondiscriminatory provision. It has authorized a public accommodations provision so that we will have a pretty good idea of what we are talking about when we proceed to discuss that important item of legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I certainly appreciate having the force of the majority whip behind what I consider one of the fundamentals of justice. If we are in a position to do justice for the Mexican national or the Mexican-American, with equal force we should be

able to do it for Americans, whoever they are.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his willingness to be present in the Chamber at this late hour. As the Senator knows, we had been discussing the subject earlier in the day, because I thought the bracero bill might be before the Senate today. But some Senators were necessarily absent and could not be here to consider the bill. I thought that we ought to get into the Record, at least, that feature of the previous legislation.

The bill which was passed by the Senate is good, sound, public policy. It is my intention that when the House amendments are called up to urge that that bill go to conference, and that the House amendment not be accepted by the Senate. I believe that we would be making a very serious mistake if we supported the House amendments after the action that was taken in this body. I know that we will have not only the support but the leadership of the Senator from New Jersey.

I should like to add once again that his work is a kind of labor of love for justice and equity, because very little public attention is given to such subjects.

Nevertheless, the Senator from New Jersey is the first Senator who has conducted wide-scale hearings on these very important problems facing our migrant laborers. There have been many other hearings over the years in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but I know of the work that the Senator has put into the subject of migratory labor. I know the work of my colleague, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], and the work of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. All of them have given great support to the measure. I am hopeful that when the House amendment is debated, we shall have the same forceful leadership that we had a few months ago when we were able to modify the bill as it came from committee and the McCarthy amendments were added to make it a reasonably good proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I wish to make one or two statements. Certainly the leadership in obtaining the improvement of the bracero program in respect to equal treatment for American workers has, of course, been provided by the Senator's junior colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. I have been working on the migratory problem ever since I have been in the Senate; but, when we were colleagues in the House, it was the junior Senator from Minnesota who first attracted me to the subject as a humanitarian part of the work of Congress. I am indebted to the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] as well as the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for the passion with which they have tried to bring hope to American migrant workers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The fact that the amendments to the Senate bill are known as the McCarthy amendments indicates, I believe, the quality of the work of my

distinguished colleague. I pay him well-deserved praise, not only for his success as a legislator but, more importantly, because he is willing to take up the cause of the migratory workers. Over the years, these people frequently have not had sufficient representation.

The McCarthy amendment is related not only to Mexican nationals but also to our own American citizens, so that Americans will be treated equally.

We should maintain the Senate bill. I know we will make a determined effort to do so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. On the subject of migratory labor, I recall that the initial work on migratory labor legislation was the result of a study made in 1940, 1941, and 1942. I was a member of the committee. I was serving in the House at the time. It was called the Tolan committee. It did not deal so much with Mexican labor and the problems existing today as it did with the whole question of the shifting of labor. This was in the aftermath of the dust storms which ravaged the Midwest, with the migration of the "Okies" and "Arkies." The discussion included the mobility in order to supply our defense plants, since we were getting ready for the onrushing war.

It was a tremendous study. I look back upon it with a great deal of pleasure. I recommend a reference to those hearings and to the reports to anyone who is interested in the general subject of migratory labor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the subcommittee has drawn on the findings and conclusions of the committee on which the Senator from Alabama served.

The senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] did much of the foundation work which has been most beneficial to the work of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and to the Migratory Labor Subcommittee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, another Member of the Senate served on that committee—the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who was a Member of the House at the time.

FURNISHING OF AUTOMOBILE TO MARTIN LUTHER KING BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, within the past few days the Department of Justice has announced that Felton Henderson, while an attorney of the Department of Justice, provided an automobile rented by the Department of Justice for the purpose of transporting Martin Luther King from Birmingham to Selma, Ala., on October 15, 1963, in order that Martin Luther King might attend a so-called civil rights rally. The willful defiance of duly constituted authority, both executive and judicial, in the name of "civil disobedience" is the declared and practiced purpose of Martin Luther King. In one community after another King has incited masses of people to defy, deliberately and contemptibly, lawful or-

ders of competent courts of those jurisdictions. He has encouraged young people, some in their early teens, to obstruct justice and to invite arrest and imprisonment. All of this, I regret to say, he proclaims in the name of the Prince of Peace and justice.

At Little Rock, at Oxford, at Tuscaloosa, the Government of the United States mobilized its military might, expended millions of its dollars, and imposed a full measure of its awesome power for the declared purpose of protecting the integrity of court orders.

With this self-professed dedication to the integrity of court orders the U.S. Government has now admitted providing transportation to one whose very purpose is to defy court orders.

That such transportation was "contrary to Department of Justice regulations" begs the real questions.

Does the Department of Justice have two standards of respect for the courts: one for those with which individuals within the Department may agree and another for those with which they disagree?

Is there such a climate of advocacy prevailing within the Department that employees are moved to bestow special privileges and benefits not available to other citizens upon those whose purpose they advocate?

Is the Department so disposed to question the integrity of every southern sheriff and other law enforcement official that it would dismiss out of hand every report emanating from such officials without even appropriate investigation?

This question is a most important one, particularly in view of Attorney General Robert Kennedy's comments regarding Sheriff Jim Clark, of Dallas County. Just as soon as I learned that Sheriff Clark had discovered Martin Luther King's using a car rented by the Justice Department, I got in touch with the Attorney General and protested the matter as vigorously as I could. I asked for a full investigation and report. In that report, the Attorney General said:

It is obvious from these facts that neither the Chevrolet nor the Ford, nor any other car rented by the Department of Justice, was used to transport Reverend King. The reports to the contrary are false. Any efforts to ascertain the truth would have revealed these facts.

Later when the Attorney General advised me that Department Attorney Henderson had lied about the matter, the Attorney General furnished me with a statement to correct, as he put it "the inaccurate information" which he had earlier furnished me. In short, on October 22 the Attorney General complained loudly that if Sheriff Clark had made any effort to ascertain the truth, the sheriff would not have made the charges that he did. However, less than 2 weeks later, on November 6, the Attorney General attempted to end the whole matter with a statement correcting "inaccurate information." Not surprisingly, there was no reference by the Attorney General to his earlier statement of October 22 that "any efforts to ascertain the truth" would have revealed the facts.

Apparently there was little regard by Martin Luther King to disclose the truth regarding this case. On October 17, Martin Luther King stated:

It seems all these charges are completely false.

On November 6, King said:

It is true I was driven to Selma in an auto that was loaned by a Justice Department official. I never denied this and strongly urged the Justice Department official not to deny it.

While Martin Luther King was at once calling the charges completely false, Sheriff Clark who had disclosed the truth was criticized.

Sheriff Clark is to be congratulated upon his alertness and forthrightness in making public the facts of this case. I have known Sheriff Clark for a long time. He is an outstanding law enforcement official. There was never any reason to doubt the accuracy of his report. Those who know him well, as I do, know him to be careful, thorough, and prudent. The manner in which his report was handled is deplorable and the Government officials responsible owe the Sheriff their sincere apologies.

As deplorable as this case is for its own sake, its greatest importance is that for which it may be symptomatic, and it is for this reason that I have raised the questions that I have. The American people are entitled to know the answers to these questions, and I have asked the Attorney General for his comment regarding them. In addition, I have asked Attorney General Kennedy to furnish me with information regarding any action contemplated by the Department to insure that departmental employees do not repeat the kind of action to which the Department Attorney Henderson has admitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not true that Mr. Henderson was not authorized by

the Department to lend the car, and is it not also true that he has since resigned, and that his resignation has been accepted?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The last part of the question is true. I assume, from what the Justice Department has said, that the first part of the question is true.

When the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., gave the facts, told where they got the automobile, the tag numbers, and traced it to the rental agency, the Department of Justice hurriedly denied that the car had been so used, and said that any effort to ascertain the truth would have shown the statement to be false. Later, when it was ascertained that Sheriff Clark was correct, the Department of Justice satisfied itself by issuing a correction of inaccurate information.

It seems to me, having made the charge which was made against the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., and having made other statements even rougher than the one I have referred to, the Department of Justice should have gone further and admitted it was wrong, and should have apologized to the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., to whom it had imputed a false report. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator is expressing what many of us hold, and what we all ought to hold; namely, that misinformation or falsehoods cannot be condoned in this type of business, or in our private affairs, either. I could be in error, but I understood that the statement which the Department at first issued was made on the basis of information supplied by Mr. Henderson when he said that he had not permitted the car to be used for other than official purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that is correct, but it seems to me that when the sheriff insisted and recorded the exact points between which the car was driven, and the tag numbers, the Depart-

ment of Justice should have required sworn statements from the attorneys who were involved, or submitted them to a lie test, instead of issuing a statement that the statement by the sheriff was absolutely false and that anybody who took the trouble to investigate would have found it was not true.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not argue with the Senator's statement that that is the way the case should have been handled. I am sure the Senator knows that I feel the so-called violation was not of such serious order. The main part that was wrong was the fact that misinformation was given as to the facts of the case, and that misinformation was used to justify something that was proved later not to be true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Do not overlook that, based upon the inaccurate information which the Department of Justice had, it made some charges it could not later substantiate. It does not seem to me fair for the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., who is a good law-enforcement officer, to be pilloried in that way, and left hanging there. To this date the Department of Justice, so far as I know, has not said a word to the sheriff of Dallas County, Ala., apologizing to him for saying that he had made a false report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure that after the Senator's speech tonight there will be some communications.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope there will be.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 19, 1963, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Latvian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the House of Representatives today marks the 45th anniversary of the declaration of independence of the once-free Republic of Latvia.

Certainly the cause of the oppressed peoples of the world merits the full attention of the entire free world, and I wish to commend and join my colleagues who are taking special note of today's anniversary and who are looking forward to the day when Latvia will be able to rejoin the community of free nations as an independent and free country.

For a Free Latvia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 18, 1963

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, 45 years ago today, on November 18, 1918, the leaders and people of Latvia declared independence for their nation, as our own forefathers did for this Republic, 150 years earlier. And, like our forefathers, Latvians paid a huge price in lives for freedom while expelling two invaders, in 1918 and 1919. That republic which rose from the ashes of World War I surely had every hope and chance of success. Latvia had educated, devoted leaders, a sense of national purpose, a victorious army, fertile lands and forests, and hardy farmers.

The Latvians proved their devotion to democracy by establishing an advanced form of representative government, with a parliament, cabinet, president and freely organized parties. All the basic freedoms enunciated in our own Bill of Rights, were guaranteed to Latvians.

But there was a corrupt Communist element in the Latvian midst, just as in so many other nations. Throughout the years of Latvian independence the Communist Party had represented only a small minority of Latvian voters. That would no doubt have continued to be the case, if Latvia had been located anywhere but adjacent to the Soviet Union, because it was only after impossible demands and then invasion by the Soviet army that Latvia lost her independence. Only then did that tiny minority of Latvian Communists triumph over democracy, and destroy the bountiful fruits of 22 years of dedicated, democratic labor.

Latvians can be sure that for a few years the example of Latvia proved to the